SCRIBAL HABITS IN EARLY GREEK NEW TESTAMENT PAPYRI

A dissertation by

James Ronald Royse

presented to
The Faculty of the
Graduate Theological Union
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Theology

Berkeley, California

May 14, 1981

Committee Signatures

Wilhelm Wuellner
Coordinator

Edward C. Hobbs

Victor Roland Gold

Eldon Jay Epp

Irving Alan Sparks

PREFACE

The study presented here was begun under the direction of Jack Finegan, with whom I first studied textual criticism. Unfortunately, my own delays have caused the project to be completed only after his retirement, and thus without the benefit of his serving on my committee. Nevertheless, I hope that the result reflects the guidance and encouragement which I received from Dr. Finegan, as well as his commitment to the study of the earliest documents of the New Testament.

I am deeply appreciative for the comments on both the overall plan of my research and various matters of detail which I have received from the members of my committee: Eldon Jay Epp, Victor Roland Gold, Edward C. Hobbs, Irving Alan Sparks, and Wilhelm Wuellner. They have given my work their patient attention over the long period of writing, and to each I offer my warm thanks. I should here mention my gratitude that both Dr. Epp and Dr. Sparks have been willing to serve as readers, even though they were not on the faculty of the Graduate Theological Union. And I would also like to express my special thanks to Dr. Sparks, who gave valuable advice concerning the methodology utilized in this study, and who made available to me the files of the International Greek New Testament Project at Claremont.

The completion of this work is to be credited in great measure to the unfailing advice and encouragment which I have received from Dr. Wuellner during my studies at the Graduate Theological Union. He has tirelessly dealt with the administrative complications involved in a dissertation written over many years, has consistently urged me to continue with these lines of inquiry, and has offered many suggestions for further investigation and for improvement of detail. I must here express once more how grateful I am to Dr. Wuellner for his many efforts on my behalf.

Of course, throughout my research I have used the holdings of the libraries of the Graduate Theological Union and associated schools, and of the library of the University of California, Berkeley. Among the many members of the staffs of these libraries who have been of service I wish to express my special appreciation to Laurence Rand of the Graduate Theological Union Library, and to Kay Schellhase of the Badè Institute and Museum of the Pacific School of Religion. And for their generous help with a wide range of administrative matters I am very grateful to

Elizabeth K. Over, Registrar of the Graduate Theological Union, and to Sharon Gay Smith, of the Registrar's Office.

I owe special thanks to my wife, Pamela, who gave a great deal of support to me during the writing of this dissertation, and who proofread the final copy.

Finally, I wish to dedicate this work to my mother, as a small tribute to her years of aid and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE STUDY OF SCRIBAL HABITS 8

II. THE SCRIBE OF P^{45} 88

III. THE SCRIBE OF P^{46} 182

IV. THE SCRIBE OF P^{47} 331

V. THE SCRIBE OF P^{66} 373

VI. THE SCRIBE OF P^{72} 450

VII. THE SCRIBE OF P^{75} 512

VIII. THE SHORTER READING? 593

IX. CONCLUDING REMARKS 616

APPENDIX A. THE CORRECTIONS IN THE PAPYRI 624

APPENDIX B. P^{46} AND THE ETHIOPIC VERSION 694

BIBLIOGRAPHY 725

INTRODUCTION

In his essay, "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P^{45}, P^{66}, P^{75},"[1] Ernest C. Colwell took what he calls an "initial step" in the study of the habits of scribes of Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. The chief purpose of Colwell's investigation was "to gain knowledge of an individual scribe's habits, and thus to increase skill in the evaluation of that manuscript." A further purpose was "to gain knowledge of the habits of scribes in general," and thus to give a firmer basis to estimates of transcriptional probability.[2]

The present study is seen as a continuation of Colwell's approach, with the following three chief aspects:

(1) In Chapter I is presented a refinement of Colwell's method, which utilizes singular readings. A more rigorous definition of singularity is given here, and a justification of the method is outlined. The remainder of the work constitutes an application, and a test, of this method of analyzing scribal habits.

(2) In Chapters II-VII the six earliest extensive Greek manuscripts of the New Testament are examined in detail, using the method of Chapter I. These six papyri--

P^{45}, P^{46}, P^{47}, P^{66}, P^{72}, and P^{75}--have, of course, received a great deal of attention in recent years, and many writers have made observations on the habits of their scribes as well as generally on the value of the readings in these manuscripts. In the place of such scattered remarks and a few more systematic studies (including Colwell's), these chapters provide a comprehensive treatment of all the singular readings in the six papyri, and a delineation of the major tendencies to be discerned within them. As might be expected, such an examination permits the correction and extension of many earlier comments and claims, and also allows direct comparisons among the papyri to be made on the basis of the commonly applied methodology.

(3) As one example of the improvement in our general knowledge of scribal habits which such a study makes possible, Chapter VIII examines the implications of the results of the individual analyses for the text-critical canon: lectio brevior potior. Although this rule has been frequently used in textual criticism of the New Testament, its statement (and supposed justificatory evidence) may well not reflect the textual phenomena of the earliest period, but rather the scribal tendencies of the later uncials and minuscules. In any case, each of the scribes

studied here demonstrates a tendency to omit, and thus a more reliable principle--at least for the period of the papyri--would seem to be: *lectio longior potior*.

Chapter IX brings together some other general conclusions based on the previous chapters, and also suggests some possible extensions of the present study.

In the presentation of the textual evidence, the following conventions are observed. The sigla for the continuous-text Greek manuscripts, the lectionaries, the versions, and the books of the Bible are taken from the United Bible Societies' edition of the New Testament.[3] The dates and contents of the continuous-text Greek manuscripts are cited from Aland's official listing.[4] The Patristic evidence is cited by the abbreviations in Nestle-Aland.[5] In the general statements of the evidence of the continuous-text Greek manuscripts, "ς" is used for the reading of the Textus Receptus,[6] and the following summary indications are utilized:[7]

pc = pauci
al = alii
pm = permulti
rell = reliqui

The use of "rell" is confined to the continuous-text Greek manuscripts, and its meaning is, of course, relative to the evidence available in the editions which were consulted.

In general, the citation of the textual data is limited to the readings found in the continuous-text Greek manuscripts, and thus readings present only in lectionary, versional, or Patristic witnesses are usually ignored. Furthermore, lectionary, versional, and Patristic support for readings found in continuous-text Greek manuscripts is usually omitted, although, for the sake of completeness, such evidence is included for the readings of the papyri examined here. It should be noted here that the citation of versional and Patristic evidence in the standard editions is uneven, inadequate, and often even contradictory; particular cases of such difficulties will appear from time to time in connection with specific readings.

The primary sources of the textual evidence are the editions of Tischendorf,[8] von Soden,[9] Nestle-Aland, the United Bible Societies, and (for Revelation) Hoskier.[10] Occasional use--noted for the most part in the text--was made of the editions of the Old Latin,[11] the Vulgate,[12] the Sahidic,[13] the Ethiopic,[14] and the Syriac.[15] The methodology outlined in Chapter I requires special citation based on facsimiles or collations of the following Greek manuscripts: B,[16] W,[17], Θ,[18] 892,[19] 1241,[20] and 1739.[21] A few further sigla and some occasional references to additional sources occur as explained in the text.

FOOTNOTES

[1] This essay is included in Colwell's Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 9 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969), pp. 106-24. The article was originally published as "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), pp. 370-89.

[2] "Scribal Habits," Studies, pp. 107-8.

[3] Kurt Aland, et al., eds., The Greek New Testament (3rd ed.; New York, London, Edinburgh, Amsterdam, and Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975). The exception to this rule is the sigla for the papyri: for ease in typing and for the sake of uniformity, I have replaced the Fraktur designations by 'P' throughout.

[4] Kurt Aland, Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments, Vol. I: Gesamtübersicht, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963). This list was continued and emended in Aland's "Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments," Materialien zur neutestamentlichen Handschriftenkunde, ed. Kurt Aland, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969), pp. 1-53. Still further changes may be found in the list of manuscripts in Nestle-Aland.

It may be noted here that the conversion of the sigla of Tischendorf and von Soden into the current Gregory-Aland numbers was accomplished by the tables in Aland's Kurzgefasste Liste, pp. 321-49. The only error which I found there concerns von Soden's A^4, which is said (on p. 345) to be 053. However, 053 contains only Lk 1:1-2:40, while von Soden regularly cites A^4 in Jn. In fact, A^4 in Jn is 2768; see Aland, "Die griechischen Handschriften," pp. 7 and 29.

[5] Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, eds., Novum Testamentum Graece (26th ed. of Nestle-Aland; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979), pp. 26*-27* (and 62*).

[6] I have followed Tischendorf's use of this symbol as designating the Elzevir edition of 1624.

[7] I have followed (as far as possible) the conventions noted in Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece, p. 28* (and p. 63*).

[8] Constantinus Tischendorf, ed., Novum Testamentum Graece, Vols. I and II (editio octava critica maior; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869 and 1872). The corrections to the text and apparatus found in Vol. III: Prolegomena, scripsit C. R. Gregory (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1894), pp. 1251-1302 have been systematically utilized.

[9] Hermann Freiherr von Soden, ed., Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte, 2. Teil: Text und Apparat (Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, 1913).

[10] H. C. Hoskier, ed., Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse, Vol. II (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929).

[11] Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung, Vol. I: Matthäus-Evangelium, ed. Adolf Jülicher and Walter Matzkow (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1938); Vol. II: Marcus-Evangelium, ed. Jülicher and Matzkow (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1940); Vol. III: Lucas-Evangelium, ed. Jülicher, Matzkow, and Kurt Aland (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1954); Vol. IV: Johannes-Evangelium, ed. Jülicher, Matzkow, and Aland (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963).

[12] Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi ad codicum manuscriptorum fidem, Vols. I, II, and III, ed. J. Wordsworth, H. J. White, and (for Vol. III) H. F. D. Sparks (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889-1954).

[13] The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic, ed. George W. Horner, Vols. I-VII (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911-24).

[14] For eth^{ro} I have used the reprint of the 1657 edition in the London Polyglot: Brian Walton, ed., *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, Vol. V (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1964). For eth^{PP} I have used the reprint of the 1899 edition: Thomas Pell Platt and Franz Praetorius, eds., ወንጌል፡ ቅዱስ፡ (Addis Ababa: American Bible Society, 1968). By the way, readers may find it helpful to note that there has been a dislocation of the text in this 1968 reprint, involving pp. 270, 272, and 279. The correct order is: 269, 272, 271, 279, 273-278, 270, 280, etc. The 1949 reprint has the text in the proper order.

[15] For syr^{p} I have used the reprint of the 1920 edition: P. E. Pusey, G. H. Gwilliam, and John Gwynn, eds., *The New Testament in Syriac* (London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1970). Syr^{s} is cited from Agnes Smith Lewis, ed., *The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion Da-Mepharreshê* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1910). Syr^{c} is cited from F. Crawford Burkitt, ed., *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, Vol. I: *Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904).

[16] Cited from the photographs in Carlo M. Martini, ed., *Novum Testamentum e codice Vaticano graeco 1209 (Codex B): Tertia vice phototypice expressum* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1968).

[17] Cited from the collation by Henry A. Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. IX (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918).

[18] Cited from the text reproduced in Gustav Beermann and Caspar René Gregory, eds., *Die Koridethi Evangelien* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1913).

[19] Cited from James Rendel Harris' collation in "An Important MS of the New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 9 (1890), pp. 31-59.

[20] Cited from Kirsopp Lake's collation in "Codex 1241," *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts*, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Silva New, Harvard Theological Studies, Vol. XVII (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), pp. 95-140.

[21] Cited from the collation by Kirsopp Lake, J. de Zwaan, and Morton S. Enslin, "Codex 1739," *Six Collations*, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Silva New, pp. 141-219.

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF SCRIBAL HABITS

> La critique des textes est une discipline
> historique. A ce titre, son premier devoir
> est de prendre au sérieux ses sources. . . .
> Je plaiderai donc la cause de l'histoire
> et surtout, au nom de l'histoire, la cause
> des documents.[1]

One of the crucial principles of Hort's masterful survey of the materials, methodology, and results of New Testament textual criticism is: "Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings."[2] As Hort's own comments make clear, knowledge of the sorts of errors which a particular scribe tended to make, and of his overall method and accuracy of copying, is an essential portion of this "knowledge of documents."[3] Accordingly, one finds in Hort's work and in the works of other critics various claims concerning the copying habits of scribes of significant manuscripts.[4]

For example, both Hort and von Soden provide data on the copying techniques of the scribes of B and ℵ, and utilize these data to justify certain conclusions about the value of the readings found in these manuscripts.[5] Further, as we shall see in detail in Chapters II-VII below, numerous scholars have attempted to characterize the habits of the scribes of the most important of the papyri. Unfortunately, however, the comments found in the works of Hort, von Soden, and others, appear usually to be based upon data which are incomplete and which have not been selected by means of a carefully formulated and implemented methodology. One consequence is that critics differ *ab initio* on the value to be ascribed to the various manuscripts, and even where they agree it is not clear what the evidence supporting the common position really is.

This lack of evidence is seen most clearly when one moves to the next level of generalization, namely, from the habits of the scribes of particular manuscripts to the determination of the habits of scribes in general. These general habits are presumably discovered, of course, on the basis of a detailed knowledge of the specific habits attributed to the scribes of some sample of the extant manuscripts. The general habits serve, then, as the basis of our knowledge of transcriptional probability (and improbability): what sorts of alterations scribes are likely (or unlikely) to have made in the text. Finally, this knowledge permits us to formulate the several canons of internal evidence which are found in various textbooks and prolegomena, and are an essential tool in the critic's ultimate task of reconstructing the original text of the New Testament.

Regrettably, though, most presentations of these canons are not--as far as one can tell from the exposition--based on the actual knowledge of documents of which Hort speaks, but rather appear to rest upon a priori reflections on how scribes behaved (or must have behaved). And when particular readings are cited--presumably as evidence--the evaluation of one reading as the original and another as arising by a scribal error is frequently suspect from a methodological point of view, and so one is left wondering why the direction of scribal error may not have been other than is claimed.

It would, of course, be beyond the scope of the present study to deal with all the secondary literature which makes claims, justified or not, concerning the habits of scribes. But a few references may indicate that the appropriate sort of evidence for such claims is often lacking, and that various problems may arise as a consequence in the evaluation of particular variants.

For instance, one of the most detailed and influential statements of the canons of textual criticism was that of Griesbach.[6] If we look at, say, his first canon, that of lectio brevior potior, we will gain the impression that Griesbach had the wide-ranging knowledge of documents necessary to delineate precisely when scribes were likely to add and when, as exceptions, they were likely to omit.[7] We may, of course, be sure that Griesbach did have such knowledge, and may well regard his distillation of this knowledge into various rules as having sound authority. Nevertheless, it is significant that no particular reading of a manuscript is cited as a foundation for this first canon. And in fact, no particular reading of a manuscript is cited anywhere within Griesbach's Prolegomena, Sectio III, which is titled: "Conspectus potiorum observationum criticarum et regularum, ad quas nostrum de discrepantibus lectionibus judicium conformavimus." The fact that Griesbach does not even attempt to present evidence for his claims about how scribes copied makes it difficult (if not impossible) for later students to know what exactly he would have considered as evidence, to check the evidence upon which his claims rest, or to revise his claims in the light of the new evidence provided by subsequent manuscript discoveries.

This difficulty becomes attenuated when one turns to those variations where the different canons conflict with one another,[8] and when one deals with issues on which competent scholars disagree.[9] As a result of the lack of clear evidence on scribal habits, many decisions about specific textual problems appear arbitrary and subjective. This judgment even applies to the recent Commentary published by Metzger as the justification of the various decisions made in the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament.[10] The fact that the editors have recorded their reasons for their decisions on the most important variations permits us to follow their claims throughout the text, and to compare their arguments at one place with those at another. Although it is clear that the editors do have a wide knowledge of documents and have utilized this knowledge in a careful manner, the claims made about scribal habits remain without explicit foundation. As a consequence, what Kilpatrick says about the Commentary seems unfortunately to be all too true:

> We can go through many comments and find what look like little bits of original composition in imagining reasons why scribes may have done this or that, but for these imaginative reconstructions we are given neither evidence nor corroboration.[11]

Accordingly, it is fairly easy to find examples in the Commentary of what appear to be arbitrary claims about scribal habits. Consider, for instance, the editors' treatment of αυτου at Mt 3:7 and 3:12. At the first variation the editors argue for the shortest reading (το βαπτισμα), even though they print a longer reading (το βαπτισμα αυτου).[12] They justify their choice by claiming that αυτου is "a natural expansion introduced by scribes. If the possessive had been present originally, there seems to be no good reason why it should have been deleted."[13] This explanation is in fact given in order to override the very strong external evidence for the longer reading.[14]

When we turn to Mt 3:12, though, we find a quite different approach. There is variation here between the presence and absence of αυτου after σιτον and after αποθηκην. Following the view that αυτου is "a natural expansion," one might opt for the shortest reading, without αυτου at either place, which is supported by f^{13} 1242 $it^{a,q}$ $geo^{1,A}$. The longer readings could then be seen as arising from this one as scribes introduced the "natural expansion" at one or both places. We would then have a nice case of lectio brevior potior, as at 3:7.

But the editors do not in fact adopt the shortest reading here. Indeed, in the second edition of their text they print the longest reading, with αυτου at both places,[15] the reading of B W 1071 1216 eth geo^{B}. On the other hand, in the third edition of the text, the one supported by the Commentary, they print αυτου only at the first place, the reading of ℵ C D^{supp} 0233 f^{1} and the majority of manuscripts.[16] They then explain the origin of the shortest reading by saying that it "seems to have arisen in the interests of literary purism."[17] We are not told what "literary purism" is, but it would appear to function by dropping pronouns, or perhaps words in general, and thus to create shorter texts from longer ones. What is left unexplained is why "literary purism" should cause scribes to omit in Mt 3:12 precisely the word which was "a natural expansion" for them in 3:7.[18]

The outcome of these two lines of argument is to make virtually pointless the appeal to scribal habits at all. For the longer reading can be explained through scribal "expansion," and the shorter reading through "literary purism." Thus, we have the appearance (at least) of arbitrariness and subjectivity as the editors prefer now one and now another mode of explanation in order to support their chosen reading. In fact, we may suspect that, at least in some cases, claims about scribal activity are brought in simply to give plausibility to choices which were made on the grounds of external evidence alone.[19] But these claims should have genuine significance for the evaluation of manuscript evidence, and should therefore at some point be justified. And in the Commentary at least, we are not given this justification or any indication of how we could find such justification.

Elsewhere, of course, we do find a wide variety of readings cited as illustrations of the sorts of errors which scribes may make, but these citations too fail to provide an adequate response to the difficulties raised. Tischendorf, for example, furnishes a useful survey of scribal errors as illustrations of his principle:

> Arcenda sunt quae quamvis pluribus probata testibus ex errore librariorum orta esse manifestum vel maxime probabile est.[20]

However, when we look at what Tischendorf cites, certain problems arise.

He claims, for instance: "Errarunt librarii scribentes ΟΤΑΝ ΑΡΘΗ pro ΟΤΑΝΑΠΑΡΘΗ Mt 9,15 et Mc 2,20."[21] There is only very weak support for αρθη at these two places, and so it is indeed reasonable to suppose that the error occurred as Tischendorf claims. But he goes on to say: "Item scribentes ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΟΙΕΝ pro ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΕΝ Mc 12,25."[22] Here the textual evidence is divided rather evenly, and it is clear that one can easily imagine the error going in either direction: scribes could have repeated the οι to go from the shorter to the longer reading, but they also could have dropped out one οι to go

UMI

from the longer to the shorter reading. So the same textual variation could plausibly be cited for either of two scribal errors.[23]

But a further problem appears. Tischendorf obviously presents only a very small sample of the errors which scribes have made within the New Testament textual tradition. Even if we grant that he has correctly described the direction of error in his examples, what value would these examples have for our knowledge of the habits either of particular scribes or of scribes in general? In fact, any such sample will be of very limited value, precisely because one has no way of knowing whether the sample is a representative sample. Tischendorf's list, for example, begins by presenting four cases of omission and three cases of addition. We thus learn, if Tischendorf is correct in his analysis of these variations, that scribes sometimes omit and sometimes add. But we do not learn whether it is likely or not that a particular scribe has added or omitted, nor do we learn how to assess the probability of each sort of error in general. And without some way of judging the probability, we are left with nothing more to say than that scribes may have omitted or added. The temptation will then certainly exist to supplement this meager knowledge with some "imaginative reconstructions" in specific cases, but these will not be based on the cited evidence.[24]

Indeed, as one increases one's acquaintance with manuscripts, it becomes clear that scribes make virtually any kind of error imaginable sometime or other.[25] Just the six papyri studied in Chapters II-VII below provide examples of many kinds of errors, some fairly obvious and expected, but some rather surprising. And a work such as Havet's comprehensive collection[26] of scribal errors within Latin manuscripts furnishes abundant testimony to the ability of scribes to err in all sorts of ways. But such collections, valuable as they may be for giving us illustrations of types of scribal error, do not in themselves give us the needed guidance in evaluating transcriptional probabilities. What we need to know is not simply that scribes can err in certain ways, but how likely it is that particular scribes or scribes in general have made a specific error. Without such knowledge our claims to explain certain readings will remain subjective and arbitrary.

In general, then, is there some way of justifying criteria of internal evidence which will avoid such problems? Or are we forced to rely solely on the dubious appeals to a priori reflections on how scribes must have behaved,[27] supported only by the persuasive abilities of a scholar to present "imaginative reconstructions" of the course of scribal alteration? The methodology of Colwell's paper on "Scribal Habits" provides a way out of this impasse by attempting to discover the actual habits of scribes on empirical grounds, in a manner as free as possible from any presuppositions about scribal behavior.

Such a study and its results can be expected to overcome at least some of the difficulties indicated above with the use of the canons of internal evidence. In the first place, one could anticipate that the habits discerned in a particular scribe's copying would aid in the evaluation of that manuscript's readings. A good example of such improvement is provided by Metzger's discussion of the variant at Lk 12:31, where the editors' text reads:

> πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

The textual evidence for αυτου and the other readings is as follows:

> αυτου ℵ B D* L Ψ 892 it^{a,c} cop^{sa,bo} Ath : του θεου P^{45} A D^{b} K Q W X Δ Θ Π 070 f^{1} f^{13} pm : του θεου και την δικαιοσυνην αυτου (Mt 6:33) 1253 vg^{cl} : των ουρανων Cl$^{2/4}$: omit P^{75}

On Metzger's own grounds of internal evidence as expressed in his version of lectio brevior potior,[28] it would be tempting to view the reading of P^{75} here as the authentic reading, which scribes then expanded in various ways. Since P^{75} is the earliest witness to the text, we would then have a situation where the earliest and shortest reading was progressively expanded until we reach the longest reading (in 1253), which happens to be the one with the latest attestation. Surely someone could present this history of the text in a suitably plausible manner.

However, the editors do not, in fact, choose the shortest text here. Metzger explains:

> It is more likely that αὐτοῦ was replaced by τοῦ θεοῦ (as has in fact happened in codex Bezae) than vice versa. The reading τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ is an intrusion from the parallel in Mt 6.33. One of the idiosyncrasies of the scribe of P^{75} is his tendency to omit personal pronouns.[1]
>
> ---
>
> [1] So Ernest C. Colwell, . . .[29]

Thus, the tendency of the scribe of P^{75} to drop pronouns is cited in order to justify an exception to the general rule of lectio brevior potior. And in this case we are not dependent on an imaginative reconstruction, since Colwell's study provides some clear data for his claim.[30]

Ideally, of course, all the major witnesses to the text of the New Testament--that is, the continuous-text Greek manuscripts, the lectionaries, the versional manuscripts, and the Fathers--would be studied in detail in order to provide this same kind of information concerning scribal habits, translational tendencies, and so on. One could then rely on empirical evidence about the witnesses for one's claims. As a consequence, what was done with P^{75} at Lk 12:31 could be done at many other places in order to give genuine explanations of how certain readings arose.

Utilizing what was discovered for the particular witnesses, one could then proceed to formulate generalizations about scribal habits which would be firmly based on the documents themselves. Such generalizations might well confirm what earlier scholars have claimed, but this would seem not always to be the case. For the study undertaken here already poses grave difficulties for the rule of lectio brevior potior.[31] In fact, any generalization at all might be problematic, since it could well appear that the patterns found in specific witnesses vary a good deal. But whatever was discovered at this stage of the investigation would have a firm basis.

Finally, then, these results could, of course, be used to make decisions about textual variants. The appeal to transcriptional probabilities in such decisions would accordingly be based on the prior examination of the relevant witnesses, and would thus (we may hope) avoid the sorts of problems which were outlined above.

Such a comprehensive study is, naturally, beyond the scope of a single work. But Colwell's own restriction to three papyri--P^{45}, P^{66}, and P^{75}--gives an indication of where the most plausible starting point may be. Indeed, if we heed Colwell's advice to "begin at the beginning,"[32] we will commence with the oldest witnesses and work down the stream of tradition. The vast majority of the oldest manuscripts are, however, too fragmentary to furnish a reasonable sample of a scribe's copying activity. In fact, of the Greek manuscripts dating from before the fourth century, only six papyri are extensive enough to be suitable for such an analysis: P^{45}, P^{46}, P^{47}, P^{66}, P^{72}, and P^{75}.[33] Three of these were already studied by Colwell, and so an examination of all six would provide both a control on and an extension of his pioneering investigation. Also, it happens that these six papyri contain material from across the textual divisions of the New Testament, and seem to give a reasonable sample of the textual types existing in Egypt during the period of, say, 175-300.

Moreover, the period before 300 was particularly crucial for the transmission of the New Testament text, since it was during this time that most of the variations with which textual criticism must deal arose.[34] Before the 1930's insight into the period could not be gained from direct study of extensive manuscripts, and so scholars such as Griesbach, Tischendorf, Hort, and von Soden, had to rely primarily on the (relatively) later manuscripts, starting with B and ℵ of the fourth century, for their views of scribal activity. Consequently, these earlier critics were forced to project what they (presumably) discovered from their examination of the later documents back to the first few centuries, aided only by the indirect evidence of the versions and the Fathers.[35] But the availability of actual manuscripts from this crucial period has made it possible now to dispense with any such projection.

Indeed, one might well have serious doubts about the trustworthiness of any inference which would suppose that post-300 scribal habits would provide reliable indications of the nature of pre-300 scribal habits. For the fourth century was probably the decisive century for what Colwell sees as the basic historical framework within which New Testament textual criticism must operate: the progressive establishment of control. Colwell in fact characterizes the "history of the entire manuscript period" by saying:

> The story of the manuscript tradition of the New Testament is the story of progression from a relatively uncontrolled tradition to a rigorously controlled tradition.[36]

Colwell's comments suggest that this control was established in a gradual fashion, but he also grants that 300 may serve as a convenient and not too misleading point of division between two different ways of viewing the text:

> The general nature of the text in the earliest period (to A.D. 300) has long been recognized as "wild," "uncontrolled," "unedited."[37]

In fact, this early period was viewed already by Hort as one of considerable freedom, or even license, in the transmission of the text. For, in his discussion of the Western text (which he dated to the second century), Hort says:

> we seem to be in the presence of a vigorous and popular ecclesiastical life, little scrupulous as to the letter of venerated writings, or as to their permanent function in the future, in comparison with supposed fitness for immediate and obvious edification.[38]

And more recently Birdsall has remarked:

> In that period we find not only looseness of citation and carelessness of transmission, but in addition the profoundly disturbing factors of an oral tradition still active and of the 'Tendenz' of Marcion and Tatian, and probably of their orthodox opponents.[39]

Of course, even apart from what one sees in the documents themselves, one could expect that some drastic shift in copying techniques would take place around the fourth century. For it was during that time that the Church gained the official power which enabled it to establish an authoritative text and to cause one textual type to be copied extensively, accurately, and eventually to the virtual exclusion of competing textual forms. It is thus reasonable to believe that the textual control of which Colwell speaks would have been intensified during the fourth century.

Moreover, it was also during the fourth century that the fundamental decisions were made with respect to the establishment of the canon of the New Testament. Naturally, some uncertainty remained, as evidenced by the peculiar textual history of Revelation, and by the inclusion of non-canonical works in ℵ and A.[40] Nevertheless, the transition from the conception of copying just ancient, important, or even sacred books to that of copying Scripture, was clearly made by the middle of the fourth century, as can be seen in Athanasius' thirty-ninth Festal Letter, which was written in 367 and names our twenty-seven books as the explicitly canonical writings of the New Testament.[41] This transition has naturally been thought by numerous scholars to have been accompanied by a shift in scribal habits. Hort, for instance, says:

> The conception of new Scriptures standing on the same footing as the Scriptures of the Old Testament was slow and unequal in its growth, more especially while

> the traditions of the apostolic and immediately succeeding generations still lived; and the reverence paid to the apostolic writings, even to the most highly and most widely venerated among them, was not of a kind that exacted a scrupulous jealousy as to their text as distinguished from their substance. As was to be expected, the language of the historical books was treated with more freedom than the rest; but even the Epistles, and still more the Apocalypse, bear abundant traces of a similar type of transcription. After a while changed feelings and changed circumstances put an end to the early textual laxity, and thenceforward its occurrence is altogether exceptional; so that the later corruptions are almost wholly those incident to transcription in the proper sense, errors arising from careless performance of a scribe's work, not from an imperfect conception of it.[42]

And Colwell also remarks:

> it is highly significant that the first expression of scholarly concern for an accurate text was concern for the text of the Old Testament. The same Origen who produced the Hexapla quotes the New Testament now from one strain of the tradition, now from another. At the beginning, the Old Testament was the Christian Scripture; and that beginning lasted longer than we think. It influenced concepts and attitudes at least into the third century. Granted that the Fathers were worse than the scribes, the scribes still enjoyed a remarkable freedom from control.[43]

Colwell appeals to the evidence of the papyri to support his historical thesis:

> In the early centuries of the New Testament period accurate copying was not a common concept. There were scribes capable of making accurate copies when adequately motivated--as for example when copying for a library. But that the New Testament required this kind of treatment was not a common idea. P^{66} has almost two hundred nonsense readings. P^{69} (also from the third century) omits carelessly, mangling a sentence (at Luke 22:41, 45)."[44]

In fact, Colwell's specific judgment on P^{66} will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter V below, and we will see some reason for modifying his view. But there remains sufficient evidence to support Hort's and Colwell's general thesis. For example, the fourth-century B already makes obvious errors much less frequently than P^{72} or P^{75}.[45]

In any case, it is certainly plausible to believe that scribal habits in the pre-300 period may have differed significantly from those of later times, and so the results of the present investigation might not necessarily be extendible to the later situation. Equally plausible would be the view that the observations of earlier scholars on scribal habits, even if they were correct about the manuscripts available to them, might not apply to the first few centuries. Only similar analyses of later manuscripts would show in what ways scribal habits may have remained constant, and in what ways they may have changed throughout the textual tradition.[46] But the crucial earliest period is clearly the place to start.

Given our choice of the documents to investigate, though, we still have the problem of formulating a method by which we may learn what the habits of these scribes were. As already indicated, we wish to find a way to characterize the habits of scribes which will avoid, as far as is possible, both any question-begging assumptions about scribal behavior, and any controversial presuppositions about the history of the text. Some presuppositions are, as we shall see, necessary; but they should be as limited as possible in order that the results attained can be used with confidence in deciding textual issues. Let us then begin with an analysis of the nature of copying.

For each reading[47] of a manuscript (other than the autograph) there are two possibilities: the reading was present in the scribe's Vorlage, which was thus copied correctly; or the reading was not present in the Vorlage, which was thus copied incorrectly.[48] This distinction (correct and incorrect) must be kept separate from the evaluation of readings as authentic or inauthentic. (The readings of the autographs are the authentic ones.) A scribe might copy correctly an inauthentic reading, and thus end up with an inauthentic reading. He might copy an authentic reading incorrectly or correctly. And he might also copy an inauthentic reading incorrectly, and even come up with the authentic reading; such a situation could arise when the scribe "corrected" nonsense readings or other "obvious" errors in his Vorlage.[49]

The two classes of readings, correct and incorrect, in a manuscript correspond to two of the interests we may have in that document. The correct readings take us behind the given manuscript (at least as far as its Vorlage), and are thus those which we look to for an understanding of the tradition of the New Testament text, and ultimately for the reconstruction of the authentic text. The incorrect readings do not directly tell us anything about the tradition behind the manuscript, but do (or can, at least) tell us about the characteristics of the manuscript's scribe.[50]

Because of the lack of immediate relevance of incorrect readings to the quest for the authentic text, there has been (it seems) a failure to explore the problem of scribal habits in the best possible case, namely, where the Vorlage of an extant manuscript is also known to be extant.[51] In such a situation we can literally look over the scribe's shoulder and compare the text he is copying and his result. The earliest such case among New Testament manuscripts is D (06), Codex Claromontanus, and D^{abs1}, also called E^p and E_3.[52] Unfortunately for the purposes of the present study into scribal habits in the early period, D^{abs1} is of the ninth century. What we need to do is to find a way of discerning incorrect readings--i.e., to use the positive term, scribally created readings--in those cases in which we don't have the scribe's Vorlage.

Colwell's approach in his article, "Scribal Habits," is designed precisely to provide such a way; he says of his work there:

> this study is restricted to singular readings (readings without other manuscript support) on the assumption that these readings are the creation of the scribe. The restriction of this study to singular readings can be made with confidence in view of the wealth of manuscript attestation for the Greek New Testament. A singular reading has been defined as a reading which has no Greek support in the critical apparatus of Tischendorf's 8th edition.[53]

Thus, Colwell's method has as its basis the concentration on what he calls "singular" readings. His view is that the singular readings of a manuscript are the textual creations of the scribe, and thus that an analysis of the patterns found within these singular readings will reveal the habits of the scribe.

In this position, of course, Colwell does not differ a great deal from what has been said by various other scholars. In fact, as is so frequently the case, Hort's observations on singular readings and their value provide a useful background for Colwell's study and for the study undertaken here.[54]

Hort defines a "singular" reading as one with "no other direct attestation whatever," including the versions and the Fathers.[55] He then goes on to discuss the value of singular readings to the critic, noting that one must distinguish those singular readings which a document may have inherited from its ancestors, and those singular readings which are "mere individualisms, so to speak, originating with the scribe or one of his immediate predecessors."[56] Hort grants that this discrimination may often be difficult or even impossible to carry out, but one can often succeed. He then says:

> Individualisms may obviously belong to various types, from purely clerical errors to alterations of purely mental origin. Sufficient clerical errors betray themselves, beyond the possibility of doubt, to enable us with a little care to form an estimate of the degree of general accuracy attained by the scribe of a given document, and also of the kinds of mistakes to which he was prone. . . . moreover the further knowledge gained respecting the habits of the scribe becomes of use both positively and negatively in dealing at a later stage with individual variations. . . . those singular readings which are evidently errors, but are not clerical errors, can likewise be classified, and the results of classification used in the same manner: for instance, in the New Testament an appreciable number of the singular readings of A consist in the permutation of synonyms, and it can hardly be doubted that these readings are true individualisms.[57]

Hort not only presents clearly the potential significance of singular readings, but also, as we have noted earlier and just seen with respect to A, gives us some examples of what may be learned about important manuscripts. Concerning B, for instance, he writes:

> When the singular readings of B are examined for the purpose here explained, it is found that on the one hand the scribe reached by no means a high standard of accuracy, and on the other his slips are not proportionally numerous or bad. Like most transcribers, he occasionally omits necessary portions of text because his eye returned to the exemplar at the wrong

> place. As the longer portions of text so omitted consist usually either of 12 to 14 letters or of multiples of the same, his exemplar was doubtless written in lines of this length. Often, but not always, an obvious cause of omission may be found in homoeoteleuton, the beginning or ending of consecutive portions of text with the same combinations of letters or of words. Reduplications due to the same cause likewise occur, but more rarely. More characteristic than these commonest of lapses is a tendency to double a single short word, syllable, or letter, or to drop one of two similar consecutive short words, syllables, or letters.[58]

And Hort provides the following summary of what he judges to be the general copying habits of the scribe of B:

> The final impression produced by a review of all the trustworthy signs is of a patient and rather dull or mechanical type of transcription, subject now and then to the ordinary lapses which come from flagging watchfulness, but happily guiltless of ingenuity or other untimely activity of brain, and indeed unaffected by mental influences except of the most limited and unconscious kind.[59]

Of Codex Sinaiticus Hort says:

> Turning from B to א, we find ourselves dealing with the handiwork of a scribe of different character. The omissions and repetitions of small groups of letters are rarely to be seen; but on the other hand all the ordinary lapses due to rapid and careless transcription are more numerous, including substitutions of one word for another, . . . The singular readings are very numerous, especially in the Apocalypse, and scarcely ever commend themselves on internal grounds. It can hardly be doubted that many of them are individualisms of the scribe himself, when his bold and rough manner of transcription is considered; but some doubtless are older.[60]

A similar use of singular readings was made by

von Soden

von Soden in his characterizations of certain important manuscripts and groups of manuscripts.[61] And, of course, observations about scribal habits based on the singular readings of various manuscripts may be found throughout the literature.[62] However, there are two questions that must be asked about such a use of singular readings.

First, will all scribally created readings occur among the singular readings? The answer is most certainly negative. For a good many of those readings which are not singular are doubtless also scribal creations which have coincidentally agreed with the scribal creations of other scribes.[63] Indeed, readings created by the scribe in order to "correct" evident errors in his Vorlage may well be found in other documents or even be authentic. It is also possible that a reading of one of our papyri was a creation of that scribe, and was then transmitted to some other extant manuscript. However, there seems to be no way in advance of the sort of study undertaken here to determine just when such coincidence or textual connection should be assumed, and so we have no method to distinguish the non-singular scribal creations from the readings copied correctly from the scribe's Vorlage. Consequently, a list of singulars will probably contain only some of the scribally created readings.

Secondly, will all singular readings be scribally created? Here the answer is not so straightforward, since some writers stress that authentic readings may be preserved in just one witness, or even in no witness at all.

Nestle, for instance, says:

> For just as in certain circumstances the correct [i.e., authentic] reading may no longer appear in any manuscript, but must be determined by conjecture, so in another case the truth may have only one solitary representative left to support it against a whole world of adversaries (Heb. xii. 3), and this solitary witness either a manuscript, a version, or a quotation.[64]

Similarly, Hort claimed:

> the singular readings of a document may always be due either to inheritance from a more or less remote ancestry, which may be of any degree of purity, or to quite recent corruption, or, which is much the commonest case, partly to the one, partly to the other.[65]

And, of course, Hort held that in fact B sometimes preserves alone the authentic text.

On the other hand, Colwell has strongly criticized such views:

> The identification of the scribe's habits in these special readings [singular readings, and especially nonsense readings and readings that have been rejected not only by other scribes but all editors as well] enables the student of a particular manuscript to discard variants that otherwise would be regarded as part of the genetic strain of that manuscript. Textual criticism must return to the position taken by Tischendorf in regard to singular readings: "A reading altogether peculiar to one or another ancient document is suspicious." This primary position of Tischendorf's, which Tischendorf failed to follow with respect to Sinaiticus and Hort failed to follow with respect to Vaticanus, merits the most rigorous observance.[66]

While it is certainly possible a priori that an authentic reading may be preserved in only one witness, or in none, the "wealth of manuscript attestation" for the New Testament, the nearness of this attestation to the autographs, and the generally recognized cross-fertilization of the tradition at many points, all make such preservation highly unlikely.

It is, furthermore, even more unlikely that such authentic readings would occur in significant numbers. For example, if the probability of a singular reading being authentic is judged to be 1% (and this would seem to be extraordinarily high), then the probability of more than five authentic readings occurring among 100 singular readings is only .000537 (.0537%), or less than 1 in 1862.[67] And the chance of larger quantities of authentic readings decreases quickly. Thus, if we have a fair number of singular readings--as we will have in any extensive manuscript--and base our conclusions upon the presumption that they are not authentic, then it is very unlikely that enough authentic readings would occur among them to affect significantly our conclusions as to general patterns.[68]

To return to Colwell's claim, though, we must note that it is stronger than the one just discussed; he believes that singular readings are not simply inauthentic, but are created by the scribe of the manuscript in which they occur. The alternative possibility to this claim is that a singular reading was really part of a tradition, a tradition including at least the manuscript's Vorlage, but a tradition which left traces in one manuscript only. Is this alternative likely?

First, and to repeat, the fact that the New Testament has been transmitted by a tradition which is highly "contaminated" and which has left such vast quantities of manuscript evidence, indicates that there were very few, if any,[69] real "dead ends" within this tradition.[70]

Secondly, as Colwell and Tune have argued, many scribal errors appear to have been readily corrected by later copyists:

> No one has been able to establish the existence of even a small family of New Testament manuscripts by using agreement in error. Errors seem to have had a short life in the manuscript period. In circumstances where individual scribes had great freedom (and thus could produce errors), their freedom seems to have included the freedom to correct obvious errors--the Nonsense Reading. In circumstances where a dominant type controlled the tradition, scribes were not free to introduce Nonsense Readings into it. In any case, the facts are that Nonsense Readings are frequent in some individual manuscripts, but they are not common to families, tribes, or types of text.[71]

Although their remarks are directly related to a special type of singular reading, the nonsense reading, Colwell and Tune's observations are generally applicable to what they call "obvious errors." Nonsense readings are the most blatant sort of obvious error, but surely many sensical readings must have appeared obviously wrong to most scribes. Whatever the precise extent of such scribal correcting may have been, it would have worked to limit the continuation of one scribe's errors into subsequent manuscripts. And thus it would tend to ensure that some, at least, of the singulars (the obvious errors) of one manuscript were not in fact part of a wider tradition, but were actually created by that manuscript's scribe.[72]

Finally, even if a manuscript under study were the outcome of some isolated stream of tradition, for most of our purposes this will simply not matter. This claim can be demonstrated as follows.

Let us say that we are looking at an extant manuscript _a_, which was the only copy made from a now lost manuscript _b_, and that the _Vorlage_ of _b_ has left its influence on other extant manuscripts. (Thus, the tradition is isolated only at _b_-_a_.) Some of the readings created by the scribe of _b_--those errors which were obvious to the scribe of _a_--will be "corrected" by the scribe of _a_ to (presumably) otherwise attested readings, and thus will not appear in _a_ at all. Other readings created by the scribe of _b_ will simply be copied by the scribe of _a_, and some of these will be singular. And the scribe of a will create his own readings, and some of these will be singular. The list of singular readings of a will thus include some (but probably not all) of the creations of the scribe of b, as well as some (but probably not all) of the creations of the scribe of a.

Since, as we are assuming, the *Vorlage* of b has had other effects (besides on a and b) on the extant textual tradition, we can conclude that the singulars in a were, at least for the most part, created by either the scribe of a or the scribe of b. For the obvious errors in the *Vorlage* of b will probably have been "corrected" by either the scribe of b or the scribe of a, while the non-obvious errors in the *Vorlage* of b will have tended, precisely because they are non-obvious, to be preserved in the other portion of the tradition coming from the *Vorlage* of b. Thus, the errors within the *Vorlage* of b will tend either not to show up in a at all, or to show up in a and in other extant manuscripts. Consequently, the singular readings of a will, at least mostly, be the result of two scribe's activities.

But in this case we can in effect just consider the two scribes of a and b as "parts" of one more complex scribe, who has created the manuscript a from the *Vorlage* of b. And the complex of scribal operations involved here is not essentially different from the complex involved when only one scribe is involved.[73] Even then, of course, the scribe may have written from dictation by a lector, so that a "multi-person scribe" was at work.[74] Thus, manuscript b just becomes a link in the production of a, a link which has left no other trace, exactly as is the case with a scribe's memory or the reading of a lector.[75]

But how might such a situation affect our eventual profile of, as we say, the "scribe of a"? To take a simple case, suppose that both the scribe of a and the scribe of b make an average of one omission by homoeoteleuton per page of Nestle-Aland, and that the scribe of another manuscript x, which is not the outcome of an isolated tradition, makes such errors with the same frequency. Some of these omissions will not be singular, but we may presume that the frequencies of singular omissions by homoeoteleuton made by the three scribes will also be (more or less) the same. Thus, manuscript a will have twice as many singular omissions by homoeoteleuton as manuscript x, and so we will, in forming the profile, judge that the scribe of a is twice as prone to omission by homoeoteleuton as is the scribe of x.

While what we call here the "scribe of a" is actually a two-person process, this conclusion is exactly what we want. For there will be, on the above hypothesis, twice as many singular omissions by homoeoteleuton in *a* as in *x* (per Nestle-Aland page). Thus, we may conclude that there were twice as many total omissions by homoeoteleuton (per Nestle-Aland page) in *a* compared with the *Vorlage* of *b*, as there were in *x* compared with the *Vorlage* of *x*. In evaluating readings of *a* and *x*, then, we will rightly judge that, *ceteris paribus*, a reading in *a* is twice as likely to have arisen from omission by homoeoteleuton as a reading in *x*. Whether this frequency of omission is due to the actual scribe of *a* being twice as careless in this respect as the scribe of *x*, or, as is the case in the example, to the compound effect of two scribes equally careless in this respect as the scribe of *x*, is irrelevant to such evaluation.

The above example was of a manuscript *a*, copied from *b*, copied from a *Vorlage* which had other influences. What would happen if the *Vorlage* of *b* did not have other influences, so that the isolated tradition was longer? Well, let us say that *b* was copied from *c*, and that the *Vorlage* of *c* had such other influences. Then the "scribe of *a*" would really be the complex scribe made up of the three scribes of *a*, *b*, and *c*. If the *Vorlage* of *c*, say *d*, had no other influence, but *d*'s *Vorlage* had, then the "scribe of *a*" would be a complex of four scribes. And so on for more complicated cases. Under each hypothesis our eventual evaluation of the "scribe"'s tendency to commit certain errors will be correct, whether the "scribe" in question consisted of one or more than one persons. Of course, the uncertainties involved in our hypothesis would becmme greater as such an isolated chain became longer, but in fact such isolation is highly unlikely for many steps because of textual contamination. Moreover, in any case we must, in tracing back the ancestors of *a*, eventually readh an ancestor which left traces outside of that one isolated stream of tradition. For we must eventually arrive at the autographs, and *they* clearly lead to branching traditions.[76]

Naturally our analysis of the habits of the "scribe of *a*" would change if the intermediary *b* were someday discovered. But textual criticism is an empirical, historical discipline, whose results must rest ultimately on the data of the manuscripts. Consequently, it must just be admitted (and cheerfully) that new manuscript discoveries could require the revision of the results of this or any other study. However, given the mass of data already available, carefully conducted studies of individual manuscripts are not likely to be made completely worthless by future finds.[77] In any case, we can hardly wait until we know that all the evidence is in to begin investigating the manuscripts.

Finally, there is one respect in which the existence of a complex scribe could perhaps skew our conclusions. This is the judgment, in some absolute terms, of the accuracy of a scribe. Our discovery that the scribe of _a_ made twice as many omissions by homoeoteleuton as the scribe of _x_ might lead us to conclude that the scribe of _a_ was exceptionally careless (at least in comparison with the other scribe), very badly trained or disciplined, or inclined to conscious shortening of the New Testament text. We might even infer that the scribe, because of his inaccuracy, did not view the text he was copying as sacred. This kind of conclusion, in the above example, would be unfounded. On the other grounds mentioned, though, this sort of situation seems unlikely, and will not in any case affect the main use of scribal profiles, namely to aid us in the evaluation of the readings of the manuscripts studied.

In what follows, consequently, I will speak of a manuscript's "scribe" in the ordinary way, that is, meaning the person who actually wrote the manuscript. Discussions of the scribe's handwriting or corrections, for instance, will obviously refer to this one person.[78]

And most of the singulars should, without doubt, be attributed to this person. However, in the discussions of patterns of errors, particularly involving those readings which are later termed "significant singulars," it should be kept in mind as a theoretical possibility that these patterns are in fact the results of the activity of a complex scribe. This hypothesis, though, seems too unlikely for our six papyri to warrant our continually burdening our terminology with explicit references to it.

In summary, then, I believe that Colwell's approach is reasonable and provides an objective way to isolate readings which are, most probably, scribally created. The resulting list of singulars is not, as noted earlier, meant to be a list of exactly the scribally created readings, but is supposed here to consist exclusively of scribally created readings. The readings we will analyze will thus be those which "can with moral certainty be assumed to have been introduced" into textual history by the scribe of the manuscript under study.[79] Moreover, this working assumption will be seen to be confirmed, at least in general, by the analyses undertaken below. Very few of the singulars among our papyri have any claim to be more than scribal errors, and the arguments that have been advanced for the authenticity of some of them will be seen to be precarious indeed when the overall patterns of scribal errors are considered.[80]

At this point we must take up the problem of defining precisely what a singular reading is. As we have seen, this term is used by Hort for a reading with no support at all, and such usage is the most natural.[81] The difficulty, though, is that it will be exceedingly arduous to determine that a reading is singular in this sense. In practice, therefore, it is necessary to relativize the term to some definite body of available evidence.

Accordingly, as we noted earlier, Colwell took the evidence to be the Greek evidence in Tischendorf, augmented in some cases by "recent finds."[82] In order to have fuller information on those manuscripts--such as W, Θ, Ψ, 700, 892, 1241, 1739, and the papyri--which are not cited in Tischendorf, the editions of von Soden, Nestle-Aland, and the United Bible Societies have also been utilized here, following an initial collation using Tischendorf. For manuscripts containing Revelation the edition by Hoskier provides still further evidence, which is all the more desirable since the textual basis of this book is, of course, limited to far fewer manuscripts than other parts of the New Testament. With these additional four editions we have a valuable extension of Colwell's body of evidence, and will be able to discard as non-singular many readings which Colwell's definition would admit. We can thus be even more confident that the readings we are left with are indeed created by the scribe whose manuscript we are examining.

Furthermore, it may be known (or discovered in the course of collation) that a close relationship exists between the manuscript being studied and one or more additional manuscripts. In such a case it may be useful to examine these other manuscripts for possible support for readings which would otherwise be deemed singular.[83] For instance, if one manuscript of family 1 were studied, the other known members of that family should be examined. When P^{46} is studied, 1739 should be included, and when P^{75} is studied, B should be included. For this sort of close comparison, one must turn to facsimiles or collations (as with, of course, the document under study), since not even Tischendorf, let alone the other editions, can be relied on for exhaustiveness.[84]

In order to facilitate such further checks, the method proposed here is to collate initially using the apparatus of Tischendorf. The vast majority of readings in a manuscript will find support there, and will thus be removed from our consideration. It will then be possible to make further collations using just the resulting list. Furthermore, instead of simply deleting readings which then find support, I have noted them with asterisks. This procedure allows some control on the accuracy of the editions other than Tischendorf,[85] since any conflicting evidence in them can be investigated further, and also permits the reader to follow all the steps after the first collation against Tischendorf.

Colwell also limited his attention to "Greek support," by which, I believe, he meant continuous-text Greek manuscripts of the New Testament (the usual New Testament papyri, uncials, and minuscules). He thus excluded consideration of support from Greek lectionaries, catenae, florilegia, and Patristic sources, as well as from any non-Greek witnesses. The well-known difficulties in assessing the evidence of witnesses other than continuous-text Greek manuscripts and the lack of critical editions of much of this material make such a restriction convenient.[86] Indeed, if such material were to be included, our eventual list of singulars would contain a large element of arbitrariness, because of the number of cases of partial or doubtful support from a version or a Father. Consequently, exclusion of this material not only makes the task of constructing a list of singulars much easier, but also helps to maximize the objectivity of such a list.

Furthermore, much of such "support" is likely to be illusory, resting only on an editor's mistake, ignorance of the language or the translational idiosyncrasies of the version, or over-zealousness in finding "agreements."[87] And even where there really is agreement with a version or other witness, such agreement may well be coincidental. Colwell, for instance, says:

> A translation to be good must be free. The translator is always tempted to extend that freedom unjustifiably. The result is inevitably agreement between any translation and a manuscript whose text was corrupted either intentionally or through carelessness. Boismard in a study of the readings of the first hand in P^{66} suggests kinship between P^{66*} and various ancient versions. Since the makers of the RSV did not use P^{66}, I compared the Singular Readings of P^{66} with RSV. In fifteen passages RSV agrees with P^{66} singulars, and in four others a parallelism is possible (cf. John 2:20; 5:29; 5:36; 8:40; 9:30; 9:33; 9:34; 9:37; 10:6; 11:27; 11:49; 12:2; 12:47; 13:1; 15:12; and as possibilities 1:27; 2:11; 5:22; 8:51). No one will suggest a genetic kinship here, but if the agreement of P^{66} were with an Old Latin ms. . . . ?[88]

Such possibilities and the vast quantity of continuous-text Greek manuscript evidence extending back even to the second century make it reasonable to follow Colwell's example, and, in general, to restrict ourselves to the continuous-text Greek manuscripts.[89]

Unfortunately, though, a few special cases arise where reference to other evidence is essential. It is clear, for example, that a list of "singulars" of D which failed to consider the Old Latin (and perhaps other versional material) would be quite misleading, since the list would include readings of D which are evidently part of a much older tradition.[90] Accordingly, one who undertook a study of the habits of the scribe of D would be compelled to grapple with the problems of dealing with versional evidence, and to cite as singular readings of D only those readings with no support from Greek manuscripts noted in the editions mentioned or from Old Latin manuscripts. Fortunately, such a situation does not occur among the six papyri studied here.

Moreover, it might happen that an isolated agreement between a manuscript being studied and some witness other than a Greek manuscript was so remarkable that coincidental agreement was very unlikely.[91] In such a case, again not found--I believe--among our papyri, the reading should be excluded from consideration as scribally created. A related case does occur in our papyri, namely P^{75}'s reading πλουσιος ονοματι νευης for πλουσιος at Lk 16:19. This reading is itself singular (it seems) even in Hort's strong sense, and appears to come--by a scribal leap--from a reading not extant in the Greek manuscripts: πλουσιος ονοματι νινευης. This Greek is the equivalent of the reading of the Sahidic version, and so the reading of cop^{sa} here, while not identical to that of P^{75}, is nevertheless the essential element in the explanation of P^{75}'s text.[92]

Consequently, it is necessary to be aware of the possibility that witnesses other than continuous-text Greek manuscripts may occasionally be of importance for the study of the habits of the scribes of such manuscripts. And accordingly I have provided any support from such other witnesses for the singular readings found in our papyri. But the readings which have only such support are still considered singular, and, except for the sorts of unusual cases just discussed, I believe that the study of scribal habits in continuous-text Greek manuscripts may safely concentrate on the evidence of the continuous-text Greek manuscripts.

In order to have a further control on the reasonableness of our procedure for defining singular readings, Professor Sparks suggested that the readings isolated at the final step be checked, where possible, against the files of the International Greek New Testament Project at Claremont. Two of our papyri, P^{45} and P^{75}, contain portions of Luke, for which the collations of the IGNTP are virtually complete (over the continuous-text Greek manuscripts, at least), and thus it would be possible to discover what (if any) support might appear for readings which had no continuous-text Greek manuscript support according to the editions and sources utilized here. The results of performing this check on P^{75}

are incorporated into the list of singular readings of P^{75} (found in Chapter VII below), where support which was found in the IGNTP files is included in double brackets ("[[...]]").

It will be seen that the hidden support thus located is meager indeed. Of the 108 singular readings in Luke, only 25 find any continuous-text Greek manuscript support at all from the IGNTP files. Of these 25, three are examples of the ο/ω orthographic confusion (14:9, 16:8, 24:30), and two others simply involve a doubled consonant (11:22b, 17:31). The support for the remaining 20 is scattered and almost always very minor. Indeed, the temptation to think that any of these agreements could be due to genealogical relationships with P^{75} rather than coincidence may be assuaged by a consideration of the patterns of readings. For instance, at 9:42a and 22:24 the omission by P^{75} of δε finds support, in the first case from manuscripts of some significance. That such support is coincidental, however, is indicated by the fact that P^{75} makes the same omission at 13:14 and 15:30, where no support at all is found, and also at 12:39, where the scribe corrected himself. Also, one may note that the shift from plural to singular which finds support at 8:13 and 23:29 occurs with no support at all at 9:52, 23:12b (and Jn 1:19). Finally, we see that the manuscripts which agree most often with our singulars are: 0211 (3 times), 1279 (3 times), Ω (2 times, once Ω* only), and 38 (2 times, once 38* only). Since the collation was at 108 readings, these figures are really insignificant.

The conclusion to be drawn from this check is, it seems clear, that we can utilize with confidence the printed editions and supplementary sources in order to isolate the singular readings of a manuscript. Naturally, if the International Greek New Testament were completed, it would be simplest to define a singular reading as one which found no Greek manuscript support there. But in the absence of such a major critical apparatus, one can be morally certain that those readings which are here defined as singular have either no Greek manuscript support at all, or, at the most, such support which is very likely coincidental.

We have yet to consider the status of corrections in the manuscript studied. Colwell in fact examines the readings of his manuscripts before correction, and thus includes as singular readings many errors which the scribes themselves corrected.[93] However, in my opinion this practice is unjustified, and may give a quite misleading impression of a scribe's activity.[94] One must distinguish between a reading left uncorrected by the scribe (whether or not a later hand corrects it), and a reading corrected by the scribe. Readings of the second sort can have no effect on textual transmission, but are relevant only to a determination of the steps by which a particular reading is created. That is, with respect to the role a manuscript will play in the history of the text, that a scribe first omits o and then inserts it (in the correct place, of course) is of no greater significance than that he writes the o clockwise. Therefore, I have considered the readings of a manuscript to be its readings after correction by the original scribe.[95] Corrections by a later hand should, of course, be ignored when considering the habits of the scribe, and should in fact be treated simply as another manuscript.[96]

On the other hand, it is certainly true that observation of the correcting activity of the original scribe can sometimes provide insight into his method of copying, just as knowledge of the scribe's style of writing may sometimes be of textual relevance. Accordingly, I have provided in Appendix A lists of all the corrections by the original scribes of the papyri studied here. Such data are used primarily to confirm the habits discerned through the lists of singular readings.

Given the preceding definitions, conventions, and comments, we are ready to produce a list of the singular readings of a specific manuscript. But we quickly discover that the resulting readings vary widely in significance, and some initial discrimination will prove useful. First of all, very many singular readings--at least in the papyri--are simply minor orthographic variations. Especially frequent are the "itacistic" confusions between ει and ι, αι and ε, and οι and υ.[97] Such variations rarely have any possible effect on the sense of a passage, and the practice of a particular scribe may show no consistency.[98] Consequently, Colwell ascribes such variations simply to the scribes' "lack of ability to spell."[99] Furthermore, the editions utilized here (except for Hoskier, who strives for completeness) do not typically cite the evidence for such variations,[100] and thus to find that, e.g., εινα is a singular reading for ινα, may mean only that editors have not bothered to report the manuscript or manuscripts which actually read εινα.

In fact, Colwell claims that there are over 600 such "itacistic spellings" among the singular readings of P^{45}, P^{66}, and P^{75},[101] and, after a brief discussion, removes them from consideration. In order to reduce the material involved in the present study to a more manageable level, I have decided to ignore certain common orthographic variations throughout the collation: interchanges of ει/ι, αι/ε, and οι/υ, presence or absence of movable ν,[102] as well as breathings, accents, punctuation, iota adscript or subscript, and other clear forms of abbreviations or writing conventions.[103] These and only these sorts of variations are thus not taken into account in producing the lists of singular readings. Consequently, the lists found below in Chapters II-VII are the lists of singular readings except those resulting from the preceding types of variation.

Once we remove these common orthographic variations, we will still have quite a few singular readings which are orthographic in nature. I propose to include these in the lists and then deal with them separately (and quickly) as the "orthographic singulars." Treatment of this class is quite possible since the number involved will be comparatively small, and a list of the less common orthographic variations in a manuscript may prove useful for evaluating the manuscript's witness to other readings. In isolating these orthographic singulars, I have relied upon standard surveys of orthographic phenomena,[104] and have not included the following sorts of readings: those which give a different word,[105] those which involve proper names,[106] and those which involve differing grammatical forms.[107]

A further special class of singular readings will consist of the "nonsense singular readings." Colwell also treats these separately, and says:

> The Nonsense Readings include words unknown to grammar or lexicon, words that cannot be construed syntactically, or words that do not make sense in the context.[108]

Colwell--correctly, as it seems to me--takes the density of nonsense readings in a document to indicate something about the scribe's care and attention to his task,[109] and so it will be useful to distinguish such readings. However, I believe that it will also prove useful to make a further discrimination between "strictly nonsense" readings (those which are not words at all [or orthographic variants of words]) and "nonsense in context" readings (the other nonsense readings). The latter readings will frequently involve confusion of similar words or forms,[110] whereas the former will be the more egregious blunders.

Finally, the remaining singular readings will be called "significant singulars,"[111] and will be granted the bulk of our attention. These will include omissions, additions, transpositions, variations in grammatical forms, and differences in proper names--that is, those sorts of textual differences which make up the vast majority of variations with which textual criticism must deal. Consequently, the delineation of the patterns found among these readings will be the chief goal of our study.

A crucial step in the analysis of our eventual list of singular readings remains to be discussed. We must decide (if possible) what the reading was which stood in the scribe's Vorlage, and thus what the reading was which he altered to create his singular reading. Only if we can do this will we be able to characterize a singular reading as an omission, addition, transposition, etc. Indeed, it is precisely here that we make our attempt to look over the scribe's shoulder and to compare his Vorlage with what he writes.

Now it happens that in many cases all of the other manuscripts agree on one reading against the singular reading of the manuscript being studied, and we may thus reasonably suppose that the scribe's Vorlage contained the reading of the other manuscripts.[112] Again, in other cases it happens that virtually all manuscripts have one reading, the manuscript studied has a singular reading, and a few other manuscripts have one or two further readings which can be readily explained as coming from the majority reading. In these cases, too, we may suppose that the scribe's Vorlage contained the majority reading.[113] In the case of transpositions, it may happen that all the readings are simply transpositions of one another; thus, whichever of the other readings was in the scribe's Vorlage, the scribe has created his singular reading by transposition.[114] In still other cases we may utilize known genealogical relationships to choose the reading of the Vorlage.[115] Also, I have generally preferred to postulate the existence of common variations of orthography or confusions of forms as being the "easier" scribal errors. Finally, there remain a few cases which are simply doubtful, and even extrapolation from otherwise attested scribal habits will not suffice to determine what the reading of the scribe's Vorlage was.[116] But such cases are, in fact, quite rare, and an occasional uncertainty will not affect the overall results of our study.[117]

In the lists of readings, accordingly, the postulated reading of the Vorlage of the manuscript being studied is given first, followed by the reading of the manuscript, and then the other readings. In the few cases where the manuscript's reading may have had one of several sources, these are listed first, followed by the reading of the manuscript, and then any other readings. All relevant textual evidence is cited, but from time to time minor variations (such as orthographic variations found in one or two unimportant manuscripts) are ignored, as well as readings not found in Greek manuscripts (except in the sorts of cases already discussed). However, when any reading may possibly serve to illuminate the origin of the singular reading being studied, it is included. The reading of the papyrus studied is always transcribed exactly,[118] with dots used to denote doubtful letters, brackets to indicate lacunae, and parentheses to resolve abbreviations.

Readings which are singular according to Tischendorf, but find support from other sources consulted, are removed from consideration by being prefixed with "**." In these cases the reading is identified only by comparison with the reading of the Textus Receptus (ϛ), and other readings are simply ignored. The orthographic singulars are noted by "(o)," and the nonsense singulars by "(n)." The remaining readings are the significant singulars.

We turn now to the analyses of the six papyri chosen here for study, and thus to what we may hope will be a partial fulfillment of Colwell's desideratum:

> The publication of a commentary on the singular readings of these papyri [P^{45}, P^{66}, P^{75}] and of other important manuscripts would be most valuable.[119]

FOOTNOTES

[1] Jean Duplacy, "Histoire des manuscrits et histoire du texte du N.T.," *New Testament Studies*, 12 (1965-66), p. 125. These same words are cited by Colwell in his "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program," *Studies*, p. 155, in connection with Hort's principle quoted below.

[2] Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Vol. II: *Introduction [and] Appendix* (2d edition; London: Macmillan, 1896), *Introduction*, p. 31 (printed in small capitals). The *Introduction* was written by Hort alone (see p. 18), and is thus cited here under his name.

[3] External considerations--age, provenance, genealogical relationships--would constitute the other major portion of this knowledge.

[4] Not only Greek manuscripts, of course, but also the versions and the Fathers may be studied from this same perspective. For the versions one may find interesting material in two recent works (with further citations therein): Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), and Kurt Aland, ed., *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, *Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung*, Vol. 5 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972). The utilization of versional evidence has in fact often suffered from the lack of knowledge of the syntactical and translational characteristics of the different versions. See, for instance, the observations on the Ethiopic version in Appendix B below.

Similarly, the habits of Church Fathers in citing Scripture should be known as a prerequisite for the careful use of Patristic evidence. See Gordon D. Fee, "Modern Text Criticism and the Synoptic Problem," *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff, (*Society for New*

Testament Studies Monograph Series, Vol. 34 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 160: "Fathers may, and *must*, be evaluated in the same way as the manuscript evidence. Some cite with precision; others do not. Some show care for the wording *per se*; others adapt and paraphrase at will. How a Father *cites* is often as important as what."

Naturally, the predominant significance of the continuous-text Greek manuscript evidence for the New Testament gives the study of the habits of the scribes of these manuscripts (and particularly of the major manuscripts) a corresponding prominence.

[5] Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 233-37 for B and pp. 246-47 for ℵ; von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*, 1. Teil: *Untersuchungen* (Berlin: Arthur Glaue, 1902-1910), pp. 906-17 for B and pp. 917-35 for ℵ.

[6] J. J. Griesbach, *Novum testamentum graece*, Vol. I (9th ed.; London: J. Mackinlay, 1809), pp. lxiii-lxxxii.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. lxiv. This rule is translated by Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (2d ed.; New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 120.

[8] In fact, the most interesting variants are necessarily those where one finds some kind of conflict (the external evidence is divided, the external evidence weighs against the internal criteria, or the internal criteria are divided), since variants where *all* the considerations point one way are easily decided. Cf. my comments in "Scribal Habits in the Transmission of New Testament Texts," *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, ed. Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1979), pp. 143-50. F. H. A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (3d ed.; Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1883), pp. 500-2, after citing some of the rules of internal evidence, notes that they are often in conflict with each other.

[9] Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 24-26, calls attention to various problems arising in the evaluation of transcriptional probability. The preference for the Alexandrian text to the Western text, resting of course in part on considerations

of scribal activity, rests upon "subjective" judgments, according to Eldon Jay Epp, "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 93 (1974), p. 392.

[10] Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1971).

[11] George D. Kilpatrick, *A Textus Receptus Redivivus? Protocol of the Thirty-Second Colloquy: 12 March 1978* (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1978), p. 12. It is remarkable that critics and editors seem often not even to appreciate that any evidence is lacking in the matter of scribal habits. An instructive example is furnished by the response by Allen Wikgren to Kilpatrick's paper ("Response," *Textus Receptus*, p. 44): "What he [Kilpatrick] regards as 'imaginative reconstructions' are simply suggestions based on a knowledge of scribal habits, i.e., an application of the criterion of transcriptional probability. The *Commentary* can hardly be expected to provide a detailed account of this every time a variant is considered. The main data are therefore presented in the Introduction."

Wikgren's point would be well taken if in fact the "data" were presented in the Introduction. However, one will look in vain in the Introduction to the *Commentary* (especially pp. xxvi-xxvii on transcriptional probability) for any "data" at all. What one finds there are various claims concerning what scribes tended to do, but no citation at all of any relevant evidence or of any source of such evidence. Utilizing Kilpatrick's terms we could say that the Introduction provides certain general patterns for the imaginative reconstructions of scribal activities. But these general patterns are themselves, as far as one can tell from what is cited, simply products of the editors' imaginations.

[12] There is also the reading το βαπτισμα Ιωαννου found in 346.

[13] Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 9.

[14] For the shorter reading Metzger cites א* B cop^{sa} Or Hil, and Nestle-Aland cites א* B 28 $\text{cop}^{sa,G68}$ Or.

[15] The second occurrence, though, is in brackets.

[16] The reading with αυτου only at the second place, supported by L 892 1424 it^{b,ff1,g1} syr cop^{G68} arm, is explained in the *Commentary* (no doubt correctly) as being the result of harmonization to the parallel at Lk 3:17.

[17] Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 10.

[18] In his *Textus Receptus*, p. 12, Kilpatrick also remarks on the *Commentary*'s treatment of Mt 3:17, and compares it with the claim (on p. 11) that at Mt 3:16 "copyists, not understanding the force of αὐτῷ, omitted the word as unnecessary." Here indeed the external evidence for the shorter reading is much the same as at 3:7.

[19] Cf. my "Scribal Habits," pp. 145-48, on these two variants.

[20] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 57. See pp. 57-60 for the illustrations of this principle, and indeed the entire section III, "De legibus in textu constituendo," pp. 47-68.

[21] *Ibid*., p. 57. For αρθη Tischendorf cites D 1 71 (and g^{scr}, which *is* 71) at Mt 9:15, and C 13 28 64 69 124 346 at Mk 2:20. (Von Soden cites f^{1} at Mt 9:15, and f^{13} at Mk 2:20.)

[22] *Ibid*. The longer reading is supported by ς A B W Γ Θ Ψ 565 1010 pm, the shorter reading by ℵ C D K L Δ f^{1} 28 700 1241 1424 pm.

[23] Tischendorf was, of course, aware of the possibility of such uncertainty: "Ab errore librariorum quid sit, ut saepe planissimum ita alibi satis est dubium. Multa rei parum gnaris peccata a librariis visa sunt quae prorsus alius sunt generis" (*ibid*.). However, he gives no indication that his example at Mk 12:25 is in any way dubious.

[24] I believe it is certain that Tischendorf did not draw the conclusion that scribes made, in general, four omissions for every three additions, and any other view would go beyond the examples he gives.

[25] Cf. Hort, *Introduction*, p. 25: "If we look behind the canons *laid down by* critics to the observed facts from which their authority proceeds, we find, first, that scribes were moved by a much greater variety of impulse than is usually supposed; next, that different scribes were to a certain limited extent moved by different impulses; and thirdly, that in many variations each of two or more conflicting readings might be reasonably accounted for by some impulse known to have operated elsewhere."

[26] Louis Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris: Hachette, 1911). Colwell praises Havet's work in three places: "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 108; "Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, p. 160; and "External Evidence and New Testament Textual Criticism," *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament*, ed. Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, Studies and Documents, Vol. XXIX (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967), p. 9.

Nevertheless, I believe that such a compendium of scribal errors found in New Testament manuscripts would by no means be an adequate guide to scribal habits. Indeed, Colwell himself recognizes the difference when he speaks of Havet under his step I, "Begin with Readings" ("Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, p. 160), and then turns to step II, "Characterize Individual Scribes and Manuscripts" (*ibid*., p. 161). Step I would thus provide the useful background to step II, but would not replace it. For, citing Hort, Colwell says of step I: "at this stage the study of readings is not final, for knowledge of documents [i.e., as attained in step II] should precede final judgment upon readings."

[27] Cf., for example, Heinrich Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre* (3d edition; Stuttgart: Verlag Kath. Bibelwerk, 1970), p. 50, where the rule of *lectio brevior potior* is followed by: "Diese Regel ist ebenso *einsichtig* wie die vorherige. Es kann eher *angenommen* werden, dass ein ursprünglich kürzerer Text nachträglich erweitert wurde, als dass man einen ursprünglich längeren Text nachträglich gekürzt hatte." (Italics mine.)

[28] *Commentary*, p. xxvii. Note also the further claim: "Scribes would sometimes . . . (*c*) Add pronouns, conjunctions, and expletives to make a smoother text."

[29] Ibid., p. 161. The reference is to Colwell's "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 121: "One of his [the scribe of P^{75}'s] habits is to omit personal pronouns; he drops more than a dozen and adds one." However, these statistics need to be revised; see below, p. 548.

[30] I have treated this variant at somewhat more length in my "Scribal Habits," pp. 140-43 and pp. 153-54.

[31] See Chapter VIII below.

[32] "Hort Redivivus," Studies, p. 159. See also his "Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts," Studies, pp. 23-24. Of course, such a procedure is simply a continuation of Hort's approach, and is a consequence of following Duplacy's advice (quoted at the head of this chapter) to take the historical nature of textual criticism seriously.

[33] Besides the other papyri from before 300, there is also the extensive P^{74} which is from the seventh century. As Epp notes ("Interlude," p. 400), "this leaves us with six papyri [those studied here] which are both early and extensive." Colwell ("Hort Redivivus," Studies, p. 157) cites P^{45}, P^{46}, P^{47}, P^{66}, and P^{75} as "documents containing a large amount of text," which can therefore "be appraised as individual manuscripts (as the fragments cannot)." The omission of P^{72} from this list would seem to be accidental.

There are also a few uncials from before the fourth century: 0162, 0189, 0212, and 0220. But these are only one folio each. The fact that the six manuscripts examined here are all papyri is actually irrelevant, since age and extent are the criteria, not style of writing or material. Epp ("Interlude," p. 400) points this out, referring to Kurt Aland's "Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus," Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967), p. 93. Cf. also the remarks of Kurt Treu, "Papyri und Majuskeln," Studies in New Testament Language and Text, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 378-79, as well as the earlier comment by C. H. Roberts, "The Codex," Proceedings of the British Academy, 40 (1954), p. 183: "There is no essential connexion between format and material, just as there is none between either and the styles of writing."

[34] Hort, Introduction, p. 93, claims that "all the important ramifications of transmission preceded the fifth century." He is talking here of text-types rather than individual variants, which would, of course, be considerably earlier. The discovery of the papyri has lowered the certain dating of many readings by a century or two (or even more), and contemporary critics of various persuasions seem agreed that most variants of interest arose before 300. Colwell, for example, in his "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," Studies, p. 55, notes: "the overwhelming majority of readings were created before the year 200. But very few, if any, text-types were established by that time." And Kilpatrick, in his "The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts," Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies, 4 (1963), p. 42, says: "Apart from errors which can occur anywhere as long as books are copied by hand, almost all variants can be presumed to have been created by A.D. 200."

Whatever the date may be as an upper limit, it seems safe to believe that we must get back behind the great uncials of the fourth and later centuries in order to understand the basic variations within the New Testament text.

[35] The Patristic evidence would of course be only indirect evidence for the scribal habits involved in the copying of New Testament manuscripts, even apart from the difficulty presented by the fact that our manuscripts of the Fathers--with only very few exceptions--are later than 300. Moreover, the versional evidence would require the same kind of projection needed from the later Greek manuscripts; for the extant versional manuscripts were also from the fourth century or later, and so one had no direct evidence for scribal activity even in the versions from before 300. (Cf. Colwell's "Grouping," Studies, pp. 7-8. As far as I can see, this situation has changed only by the discovery of a few Sahidic manuscripts which may date from the third century; see Metzger, Early Versions, pp. 110-12, numbers 1, 3, 5, and 6.) Furthermore, use of the versional evidence would require an additional step of inference from whatever one might find in the versions to the situation in the Greek manuscripts, which are the essential documents.

[36] "Hort Redivivus," Studies, p. 164. The entire section, pp. 164-69, is devoted to the topic of control.

[37] *Ibid*., p. 166, n. 1.

[38] *Introduction*, p. 126.

[39] J. N. Birdsall, *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), p. 18.

[40] The different portions of the New Testament and even the various books have, of course, had different textual histories; cf., for example, Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, p. 169.

[41] A useful summary of the salient points regarding the New Testament canon may be found in Paul Feine and Johannes Behm, *Introduction to the New Testament*, ed. Werner Georg Kümmel, tr. A. J. Mattill, Jr. (Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1966), Part II, "The Origin of the Canon of the New Testament," pp. 334-58 (the Festal Letter of Athanasius is discussed on p. 350).

[42] *Introduction*, p. 7.

[43] "Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, p. 165. However, a dissenting view is presented by Kilpatrick in his *Literary Fashions and the Transmission of Texts in the Graeco-Roman World: Protocol of the Nineteenth Colloquy: 11 January 1976* (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1976), p. 5:

> "Certainly in Biblical texts a hardening seems to have developed against deliberate change. If I may summarise the view that I had expounded in my paper on Atticism on this point, the position is as follows. Until the end of the second century A.D., scribes and others seem to have had a considerable freedom in making stylistic and general alterations. It has been suggested that as a text became canonical, scribes and editors felt less and less free to make alterations in the text. This is not borne out by the facts. The Pentateuch in Hebrew and Greek was canonical before any of our manuscripts, but our evidence for the text down to about A.D. 100 is evidence of great variety. In the LXX we can go further and say that the text was still being revised in the first century A.D. Likewise with the Gospels. If the four Gospel canon was already in being by A.D. 140 this did not prevent Tatian from making changes about A.D. 170. In fact we can argue

> that many of our deliberate alterations can be shown to have been made before A.D. 200, and very few can be proved to have been made later."

Of course, Kilpatrick clearly accepts the contrast between the earlier period of freedom and the later period of control, but dates the shift even earlier than the fourth century. However, it is not clear to me that there is any significant contrast with respect to scribal freedom to be discerned between the papyri from before 200 and those of the third century. In fact, P^{75} is cited by Colwell ("Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 118) as showing the presence of such control, and this manuscript is dated to 175-225. On the other hand, lack of control is found by Colwell (ibid.) in the third century P^{45}.

Furthermore, Kilpatrick's references to the "canonical" status of the Pentateuch and the four Gospels may be misleading. He indicates that "the four Gospel canon was already in being by A.D. 140," but in fact there was no unanimity on this canon, as evidenced by the later rejection of the Gospel of John, and by the later (even if temporary) acceptance of the Gospel of Peter (see Feine and Behm, Introduction, p. 344). Even Eusebius alludes to some partisans of the Gospel of the Hebrews (ibid., p. 349).

Moreover, some shift in the status of the Pentateuch may well have taken place about the end of the first century, after which scribal freedom seems to have been very limited. See, for example, the following comments by James A. Sanders, "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method," Journal of Biblical Literature, 98 (1979), p. 22:

> "Barthélemy has shown that the phenomenon of the cessation of scribal changes in the early first century CE, those called tiqqunê soferîm, was a stage in the development of the shift in basic concept of scripture in the period. . . . The shift from understanding scripture as sacred story to sacred text was long and gradual; but it took place precisely in what in text criticism we call Period Two, that of the accepted texts. . . . the older attitudes [of the books as not being verbally inspired] still held on and did not completely die out until the final period of textual standardization after 70 CE."

If Sanders is right, scribal control was indeed connected with a particular attitude toward the books being copied.

[44] "Hort Redivivus," Studies, p. 165.

[45] A useful comparison of P^{72} and B is provided by Sakae Kubo, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, Studies and Documents, Vol. XXVII (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965), pp. 11-12, 17, who reports on the "obvious scribal errors" found in 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude. Although the details of Kubo's classification raise some questions, he cites 30 readings from P^{72}, with another 7 "probably" to be added. From B he cites only 7 readings.

Similarly, Carlo M. Martini, *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV*, Analecta Biblica, Vol. 26 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966), cites the "errori palesi" of P^{75} in Luke in his Lista 2 (pp. 166-68), and the "errori palesi" of B in Luke in his Lista 3 (p. 169). Although there may be some doubts about a few of Martini's citations, the contrast is striking, since 84 readings of P^{75} are listed, but only 26 readings of B. Martini comments (p. 56): "La differenza tra B e i papiri [P^{75} and other papyri] è palese, e significa non soltanto una maggiore accuratezza dello scriba di B, ma anche il crescere delle esigenze e lo svilupparsi della tecnica scribale presso le comunità cristiane, soprattutto per quanto riguardava le copie di uso pubblico." (On pp. 54-55 Martini also presents some data on the errors in P^{45}, P^{46}, and P^{66}, in contrast to P^{75}.)

[46] Cf. Colwell's remark ("Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, p. 160): "We need a series of compendia of corruptions from the Greek manuscripts, from the individual versions, from the Fathers--comparable to the work of L. Havet on the Latin manuscripts of the classics. *But the knowledge gained from one of these compendia cannot be transferred to another, nor can the knowledge gained from one period be generalized for another, nor can the treatment of one part of the New Testament be generalized for the entire canon*."

[47] I follow Eldon Jay Epp, "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant,'" *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, p. 167, in using 'reading' as the most general term for a textual divergence.

[48] I will assume that the scribe, for a given reading, was following exactly one *Vorlage*; the more complex case of two or more *Vorlagen* does not, I believe, make an essential difference to the points discussed here.

UMI

[49] Cf. also Hort, *Introduction*, p. 36, for these general points. Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, p. 168, says: "And one comment on the editorial work of scribes and editors needs to be made now--capable scribes and editors often left the text closer to the original than they found it." Of course, in such cases what we will often have is, in effect, that the scribe simply shifts his *Vorlage* by copying (perhaps from memory) the reading of another codex.

[50] Cf. Epp, "Clarification," p. 154: "The scribal error, however, may be a 'significant' variant reading for the study of scribal habits and characteristics even though it is not 'significant' for broader text-critical tasks."

[51] That is, as regards the New Testament text. Frederick William Shipley, *Certain Sources of Corruption in Latin Manuscripts* (New York: Macmillan, 1904), studies a fifth century manuscript (P) of Livy and its ninth century copy (R). He has some interesting methodological comments, but does not make a comprehensive study of R's incorrect readings, and does not try to give a profile of the habits of the scribe of R. Rather, Shipley just cites examples of the errors found. The pattern of errors is, as we have seen, more important than a simple list of the types of errors present, and Shipley too often gives the latter but not the former.

[52] In Aland's official list (*Kurzgefasste Liste*, p. 37) D^{abs1} does not even merit a Gregory number. Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 254-56, discusses the codex, but says that "the exact knowledge that we possess of the original D_2 renders attention to the copy E_3 superfluous" (p. 255). Similarly, Eberhard Nestle, *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*, tr. William Edie, ed. Allan Menzies (London: Williams and Norgate, 1901), p. 77, says of the manuscript: "in the Greek merely an incorrect transcript of D_2, and may therefore be dismissed."

Kirsopp Lake, in "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels: Excursus I: The Ecclesiastical Text," *Harvard Theological Review*, 21 (1928), pp. 348-49, comments on the apparent rarity of extant examples of *Vorlage* and copy, citing only possibilities from families 1 and 13, as well as 205, a copy (it seems) of 209. Lake also notes that "the manuscripts which we have are almost all orphan children without brothers or sisters," and concludes: "Taking this fact into consideration along with the negative result of our collation of MSS. at Sinai, Patmos, and Jerusalem, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the scribes usually destroyed their exemplars when they had copied the sacred books."

An alternative possibility is suggested by Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Four Gospels (5th impression; London: Macmillan, 1936), pp. 103-4:

> "Assuming, then, that the authorities at Constantinople had decided to adopt it [the Lucianic revision], what would become of the fifty copies given by Constantine? They were not written on perishable papyrus, but on vellum; and the vellum on which the two contemporary MSS. B א were written is still in excellent preservation after the lapse of nearly 1600 years. They would not be destroyed, they would be corrected--some copies more thoroughly than others, some in one place, some in another. In the course of time the wealthier churches of the city would desire clean new copies, undisfigured by constant correction. They would get these from the best reputed copying establishments, whether secular or monastic, in Constantinople. Such establishments would have been careful to provide themselves with copies of the standard text; so the new copies would represent the Lucianic text. What would become of the old ones? Most probably they would be given away or sold cheaply to smaller churches or monasteries in the provinces, who could not afford to buy new and clean copies of the standard text. Thus many of the fifty copies originally made for Constantinople, more or less corrected to the standard text, would get into the provinces. Some of them in all probability are the ancestors of some of the mixed MSS. we now possess."

Such scattering of older manuscripts could, it seems, occur at any time within the period of textual transmission, and could result in the exemplars being sent to places where their preservation would be unlikely. And, in any case, the mixture of which Streeter speaks would be continually occurring, owing to the process of correcting the older copies.

[53] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 108.

[54] Colwell, of course, recognizes his debt to Hort in this matter as in so many others.

[55] *Introduction*, p. 230.

[56] *Ibid*., p. 232.

[57] *Ibid*., pp. 232-33. The two sentences from the second ellipsis here are quoted in note 79 below.

[58] *Ibid*., pp. 233-34.

[59] *Ibid*., p. 237.

[60] *Ibid*., pp. 246-47.

[61] See the references in note 5 above for von Soden's comments on B and ℵ. He also attempted to classify the readings characteristic of textual groups (their "individualisms," so to speak); for his treatment of the Alexandrian text, for example, see *Die Schriften, Untersuchungen*, pp. 1471-72 (§335: "Sonderlesarten und Charakter der Rezension *H*").

[62] Many such observations will be found cited in Chapters II-VII below. Here we may note a few further examples from Hoskier, who, in his study of the manuscripts of Revelation, frequently relies on singular readings to draw inferences about scribal habits. Cf. *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, Vol. I (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929), p. 20: "We now approach our examination of the solecisms of this codex [Hoskier's 12 = 181], and we are sure the reader will be surprised, notwithstanding all the foregoing (and remembering that in the average cursive MS. there are a mere dozen), to learn that there are no less than 205 unique readings in these short xxii chapters, *not* counting 201 cases of unique varieties of spelling *etc*. And of these 205 cases, only 20 are additions, *including* 6 glosses. Omissions number 98; . . . This large number of omissions points to great carelessness and *not* to 'a shorter text being preferable.'"

See also p. 140 ("From the above few errors it will be seen how carefully the MS. [Hoskier's 48 = 242] was executed.") and p. 159 ("What strikes me most, and what I cannot get over, is that 52 [= 337] has *absolutely no new reading peculiar to itself*. This is the first time I have come across a MS. so faithfully copied.").

[63] I believe that the likelihood of coincidental agreement is generally under-estimated in textual considerations. Metzger, "The Caesarean Text of the

Gospels," *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963), p. 72, says: "the possibility of mere chance coincidence among manuscripts in agreeing in small variations (involving *inter alia*, word order, common synonyms, the presence or absence of the article, the aorist for the imperfect or historical present) has not been sufficiently taken into account." Similar remarks may be found in his *Text*, p. 165 and p. 181.

[64] *Introduction*, p. 195.

[65] *Introduction*, pp. 231-32.

[66] "Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, pp. 161-62. Colwell refers here to Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 54: "Pro suspectis habenda sunt quae uni vel alteri horum testium prorsus peculiaria sunt, tum quae classium quae videntur esse certam indolem ab homine docto profectam redolent." Hort also states such a general principle (*Introduction*, p. 44): "Where a minority consists of one document or hardly more, there is a valid presumption against the reading thus attested, because any one scribe is liable to err, whereas the fortuitous concurrence of a plurality of scribes in the same error is in most cases improbable; and thus in these cases the reading attested by the majority is exempt from the suspicion of one mode of error which has to be taken into account with respect to the other reading."

It may be noted here that Colwell came to have some doubts about his own procedure. In the passage referred to above Colwell shifts from considering singular readings generally by writing ("Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, p. 161): "the scribe's contribution *can* be identified--notably in singular readings, especially in nonsense readings, or in readings that have won universal rejection not only from other scribes but from all editors as well." He then remarks (in note 3): "In retrospect, I feel more confident of my own identification of the scribal habits of P^{66} and P^{75} than I do of those of P^{45}. In P^{45} few of the 'singular readings' meet the two additional requirements stated above."

However, I believe that Colwell's doubts are without foundation. Rather, it will be argued in Chapter II that, as Colwell himself indicated in his "Scribal Habits," the fact that P^{45} has comparatively few nonsensical singulars is an important clue to the attitude toward the text and the task of copying which was held by P^{45}'s scribe. Furthermore, the approval given occasionally to the singular readings of P^{45} (as well as to those of the other papyri studied here), will be seen to be, at least in general, unwarranted. Cf. also note 80 below.

[67] The chance of exactly k authentic readings occurring among n singulars, given that the probability of a singular reading being authentic is r, is:

$$\frac{n!}{k!\,(n-k)!} \cdot r^k \cdot (1-r)^{n-k}$$

If we set n = 100, in order to consider a set of 100 singular readings, and say the probability of a singular reading being authentic is $\frac{1}{100}$, then this formula gives:

$$\frac{100!}{k!\,(100-k)!} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{100}\right)^k \cdot \left(\frac{99}{100}\right)^{100-k}$$

The results for the first few values of k are:

k	chance of k singulars being authentic
0	.366031
1	.369729
2	.184864
3	.060999
4	.014942
5	.002898

The cumulative figures are therefore:

authentic readings	chance
0	.366031
0-1	.735760
0-2	.920624
0-3	.981623
0-4	.996565
0-5	.999463

Thus, the chance of 6 or more authentic readings occurring is only 1-.999463, or .000537. As will be seen from just the first six cases, the chance of even larger quantities rapidly diminishes to the point of practical impossibility.

[68] While it is clear that our estimate of a 1% chance of a singular reading being authentic is much too high with respect to the entire set of singulars within

the manuscript tradition, one might well wonder whether the estimate might even be too low for a specific manuscript. In particular, might not the singular readings of B have a greater chance of being authentic?

In response, though, we may first note that Hort's high opinion of B is generally modified by contemporary critics; see, for example, the remarks by Metzger, Commentary, pp. 270-72, on the need for an eclectic procedure in dealing with Acts. Furthermore, quite a few of the readings of B which were singular at the time of Hort have now found support, notably from P^{75} (see Martini, Il problema, Lista 6, pp. 181-83: "Lezioni distintive P^{75}-B").

Most importantly, however, even Hort grants that B contains many readings which are mere scribal errors. Besides the analysis already quoted, one may consider the following comment (Introduction, pp. 238-39): "so many readings of B by itself commend themselves on their own merits that it would be rash to reject any hastily, though undoubtedly not a few have to be rejected at last. Occasionally too some stray quotation of a Father shews that readings of B which might have been thought to be individualisms were really at least several generations older than the age when B was written. . . . But, wherever there is no such accessory authority, clear internal evidence is needed to justify the acceptance of singular readings of B, since the possibility that they are no more than individualisms is constantly present."

Moreover, none of our papyri would seem to merit anything like the respect which Hort gave to B; see, for instance, the figures cited in note 45 above. And, in any case, an initial study of all the singular readings will prove--as mentioned in note 80 below--useful for any further arguments concerning the authenticity of some of them.

Finally, we may note here that the numbers cited in the previous note would, of course, be changed drastically if one were dealing with a manuscript whose singular readings were more likely to be authentic. For example, if one estimated the chance of a singular reading being authentic at one in ten, then there would be a probability of .942551 that 6 or more authentic readings would occur among 100 singulars. That is, there would be an excellent chance that there would be enough authentic readings to alter considerably one's analysis. But, obviously, more than one or two manuscripts could hardly have such a privileged position in textual history that so many of their singulars would be authentic; indeed, I believe that one can suppose with confidence that no manuscript is so situated.

[69] Epp, "Interlude," p. 395, states that "the P^{45}-W line stops with W and leads no further." Such a case, while perhaps the best example of a more or less isolated tradition in New Testament textual history, provides no direct counterexample to our claim, since the tradition here is obviously not limited to one manuscript, and since furthermore P^{45} and W do not--it appears--stand in a direct relation of descent.

[70] Cf. Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (London: The British Academy, 1953), p. 9: "In the New Testament the amount of contamination is large because the evidence is uniquely large. Its very vastness, as Bentley urged, gives unique opportunity for the attainment of the critical task." For Bentley's own statement, see Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 232.

[71] Ernest C. Colwell and Ernest W. Tune, "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings," *Studies*, p. 102. Cf. also Colwell's comments on the nonsense readings in P^{75} and B, in "External Evidence," pp. 6-7.

[72] See (again) the comments on control in Colwell's "Hort Redivivus," *Studies*, pp. 164-69.

[73] Cf. Metzger's description (*Text*, p. 16) of the four operations involved in copying: reading of the *Vorlage*, remembering this material, dictating this material to oneself, and the movement of the hand.

[74] *Ibid*., pp. 14-15.

[75] Assuming, that is, that the lector's dictation has been preserved in only one manuscript, or in the descendants of only one manuscript. I may note here that Hort, in the characterization of individualisms quoted above on p. 30, seems to recognize that it may sometimes be necessary to consider an isolated textual tradition as one textual unit. For he there in effect defines the individualisms of a manuscript as those readings which were created by "the scribe or one of his immediate predecessors."

[76] This point assumes that the branching began *before a*. Otherwise, all the streams of textual tradition

would go back to a. In such a case, we might just view a as the autograph, since even if it really isn't, we could--ex hypothesi--go back from a to the autograph only by conjectural emendation. But, in any case, none of our extant manuscripts would seem to be an at all plausible candidate for such a position in textual history.

[77] Some idea of the extent to which a new discovery could affect previous results can be gained by noting the number of singular readings in B which have now actually been supported by P^{75}. See (again) Martini, Il problema, Lista 6, pp. 181-83, "Lezioni distintive P^{75}-B," and the discussion on pp. 72-82. Clearly, a study of the singular readings of B made before the discovery of P^{75} (and other papyri) would now have to be revised.

[78] Fortunately, each of our six papyri had only one scribe. An analysis of manuscripts which were copied by more than one person--such as B and ℵ--would, of course, require separate treatment of the different persons; see, for example, the discussion of the different sorts of errors made by the four scribes of ℵ in H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus (London: British Museum, 1938), pp. 53-55.

[79] The quoted phrase is taken from the following comment by Hort, Introduction, p. 24:

> "The value of the evidence obtained from Transcriptional Probability is incontestable. Without its aid textual criticism could rarely attain any high degree of security. Moreover, to be rightly estimated, it must be brought under consideration in the higher form to which it can be raised by care and study, when elementary guesses as to which reading scribes are likely in any particular case to have introduced have been replaced by judgements founded on previous investigation of the various general characteristics of those readings which can with moral certainty be assumed to have been introduced by scribes."

[80] The initial establishment of the habits of a scribe gives, in any case, a firm basis for possible arguments that certain singulars are not mere scribal errors. Hort (Introduction, p. 233) says clearly:

> "Singular readings which make good sense and therefore need imply no clerical error, but which might also be easily explained as due to a kind of clerical error already fixed upon the scribe by undoubted examples, are rendered by the presence of possible clerical error as a vera causa more doubtful than

> they would otherwise be. Singular readings which make good sense, and which cannot be explained by clerical error except such as lies outside the known proclivities of the scribe, acquire a better title to consideration."

This latter situation appears rarely, if ever, to occur among the singulars of our six papyri, whereas the former will be seen to be frequent.

Hort, of course, thought that some of the singulars of B were of the second sort; see *Introduction*, p. 240, where he responds to the view that B is secondary at certain variants by arguing *inter alia* that "the process hypothetically attributed to the scribe of B is incongruous with all that is known of his manner of transcription and capacity of criticism."

By the way, at one point Hoskier claims that an examination of just the transpositions in a manuscript will indicate how accurate the scribe was, saying that a paucity of them "indicates at once the reliability of a scribe and his correctness in copying" (*Text*, p. xxvii). Hoskier accordingly argues that, even though there are numerous other sorts of singular readings, the presence of few singular transpositions, as in his 200 (= 2329), shows that the "scribe was faithfully copying the elder document and that practically all the *other* changes were present in the parent MS" (*ibid*., p. xxviii). This a priori approach, however, is indefensible.

[81] We may state here one peculiar exception to this principle. Where there exists a known descendant of a manuscript being studied, agreements with that descendant must, of course, be ignored. What we then have is the situation described on p. 32 above: there *is* agreement, but the agreement, since it is with a dependent witness, does not indicate that the reading was inherited by the manuscript under study. This is really just another way of saying that known descendants of extant manuscripts are textually insignificant, and consequently I will assume that they are ignored in determinations of singularity. Such cases are rare (see note 52 above), and do not involve our papyri.

Incidentally, Tischendorf does cite D^{abs1} (as E in the Pauline Epistles), and Gregory subsequently remarks (Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 424): "Re vera, quod ad textum Graecum attinet, delenda est notatio huius codicis praesertim codice primario D Claromontano nunc plenissime et accuratissime edito."

[82] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, pp. 108-9: "A singular reading has been *defined* as a reading which has no Greek support in the critical apparatus of Tischendorf's 8th edition. It is true that some witnesses unknown to Tischendorf may support some of these readings, but it is also highly probable that many readings with minor support in Tischendorf are scribal creations. Where the support of recent finds was known, the reading was eliminated from our list; but no rigorous effort was made to go beyond the evidence of Tischendorf's apparatus."

[83] In fact, one of Colwell's "suggestions" made on the basis of his study (*ibid*., p. 123) is that, in effect, *only* such manuscripts need be examined: "The singular readings of a particular manuscript should be studied not against Tischendorf or Nestle or the Textus Receptus, but rather against the consensus of the Text-type to which the manuscript belongs. The singulars of P^{75} should be studied with reference to the Beta Text-type (Vaticanus and friends)."

However, I have here preferred to adopt a wider basis of comparison in order (a) to have a more uniform procedure of collation, and (b) to avoid the difficulties which arise in trying to classify the papyri by means of the traditional textual types. P^{75}, of course, is clearly Alexandrian, and one would not, I believe, go too far wrong in viewing as scribally created its readings which do not receive support among, let us say, ℵ B C L 33 892 1241. Unfortunately, though, the other papyri studied here do not fit so neatly into specific textual types but are, as has been frequently observed in the literature, "mixed." Consequently, the attempt to reduce substantially the basis of collation for them would, it appears, run the risk of ignoring evidence which *might* be textually related, and would also doubtless lead to many borderline decisions.

(I recognize, by the way, that such talk of "mixture" in the papyri is methodologically suspect, as Colwell, "Grouping," *Studies*, p. 24, notes. But we are for the present confined to the textual classifications which are based upon the later documents.)

Finally, this sort of study utilizing a wider class of evidence should give information which would be valuable in assessing when agreement among manuscripts may be coincidental and when it may point to a genetic relationship. Cf. Colwell's next "suggestion," which is closely related to the one quoted above ("Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 123): "Since corruption was universal, identical singular readings with only minor scattered support elsewhere should be assumed to be coincidental in these agreements--unless other external evidence establishes relationship."

[84] E.g., Tischendorf does not record the reading ενεγετο (for εγενετο) of D in Jn 1:3. And, according to Hoskier, "Von Soden's Text of the New Testament," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 15 (1913-14), p. 318, Tischendorf "neglects to record some *fifty-five* readings of א" in John alone. Some more systematic data on the incompleteness of modern editions is given by Merrill M. Parvis, "The Need for a New *Apparatus Criticus* to the Greek New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 65 (1946), pp. 353-69, who draws the conclusion (pp. 367-68): "We have noted errors in the citations of all of the *apparatus critici*. The greatest confusion is caused today, however, just as it was in the days of Scrivener, not by errors, but by the incompleteness of the citations."

[85] Although a few errors in Tischendorf were discovered in the course of this study, it seems that there is little reason--even if it were possible--to attempt to check systematically the mass of evidence in Tischendorf for the purposes at hand. However, it is often claimed that von Soden is unacceptably inaccurate. Metzger, for instance, says (*Text*, pp. 142-43): "Though absolute accuracy in an extensive critical apparatus is probably unattainable, where von Soden's work can be tested it has been found to contain a higher percentage of errors than is usually considered to be consistent with trustworthy scholarship." Nevertheless, I believe that a fair percentage of the claimed "inaccuracies" in von Soden are in fact the results of a failure to understand his (admittedly complex) apparatus. See, e.g., W. J. Elliott, "The Need for an Accurate and Comprehensive Collation of All Known Greek NT Manuscripts with their Individual Variants noted *in pleno*," *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 137-43, and my reply, "Von Soden's Accuracy," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 30 (1979), pp. 166-71.

Parvis, "The Need," cites data which support the view that Tischendorf is more accurate and more complete (for the material he reports) than is von Soden. However, Parvis (p. 363) commits at least one error when he claims that von Soden cites L for both στηκετε and εστηκητε at Mk 11:25. Von Soden's text has στηκητε, and he indeed reports L for the variants στηκετε and εστηκ-. But it is thus clear that the first citation is for -ετε, and the second for εστ-. Since L occurs at both, it should be taken (correctly) as reading εστηκετε. Von Soden here just follows the practice of Tischendorf of sometimes reporting variations in different portions of a word independently. (At Mk 11:25, though, Tischendorf does give L separate treatment.) See, for instance, the treatment of γεθσημανει at Mt 26:36 in both editions.

[86] Cf., for example, Epp, "Classification," pp. 163-64.

[87] Several such cases are mentioned in Chapters II-VII below, and Appendix B gives more systematic attention to some supposed agreements between P^{46} and the Ethiopic version. See also, as one recent example, the second remark concerning the versions in Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece, p. 18* (= pp. 54*-55*). (On the other hand, Nestle-Aland fails to note the genuine support from the Ethiopic for the readings at Jn 21:6 and He 9:2-4 cited in note 91 below; cf. ibid., pp. 23*-24* [= p. 59*], for the use of minor versions.)

[88] "Scribal Habits," Studies, pp. 123-24. While Colwell's general point is, I believe, well taken, some revision in his examples should be made. First of all, he includes among his fifteen readings six which are those of P^{66*} only: 2:20 (a very doubtful agreement anyway), 5:29, 5:36, 8:40, 10:6, and 12:2. Three more readings of P^{66} are not really supported by RSV: 11:27 (where P^{66} adds πιστευω, but RSV just translates the πεπιστευκα found in P^{66} and other manuscripts), 13:1 (where the RSV's 'had come' could agree with the εληλυθεν of the majority text), and 15:12 (where the RSV's 'as' agrees with the usual καθως just as much as with P^{66}'s ως). Three other readings are not in fact singular: 9:33, 9:34 (supported by 142* in Tischendorf), and 12:47. So we are left with only three agreements with P^{66} after correction: 9:30, 9:37, and 11:49. Even these three, though, are sufficient to make us wary of isolated versional support.

Of the four "possibilities" cited by Colwell, two (2:11 and 5:22) are corrected, and 8:51 is in fact supported by 1093 (at least I assume this is the reading involved). His reference to 1:27 is presumably meant to to refer to one of the following two readings: the position of αυτου, which would be a very dubious agreement; or the use of ικανος (from Mt 3:11, Mk 1:7, Lk 3:16). RSV does use 'worthy' in the Synoptic texts as well as in John, although the term seems to be a quite reasonable translation of the usual αξιος at the latter verse. Moreover, P^{66} is supported there by P^{75} and 472, so this would hardly be a singular reading. Nevertheless, Colwell (*ibid.*, p. 113) cites this reading from "both P^{66} and P^{75}," suggesting that he treats it as singular in *each* manuscript.

[89] Cf. further the first remark concerning the versions in Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, pp. 17*-18* (= p. 54*), and the earlier statement by Colwell, "Grouping," *Studies*, pp. 7-8.

[90] Epp, "Clarification," pp. 163-66, notes that Codex Bezae and the Western text furnish the major problem for a general restriction to Greek manuscript evidence.

[91] Cf. Metzger, "Caesarean Text," p. 72: "Manifestly a spectacular variant, such as the presence of the *pericope de adultera* after Luke 21.38 in the manuscripts of family 13, has real significance in disclosing the textual affinities of a given manuscript." However, this reading is found only in f^{13}, and I am not in fact able to cite an agreement between just one Greek manuscript and a witness other than a Greek manuscript, which is "spectacular" enough to rule out coincidental agreement. Hort, for example, cites B's reading το μη εαυτης (for τα εαυτης) at 1 Cor 13:5 as a reading which is shown by Clement's support not to be a mere individualism of B (*Introduction*, p. 239; this passage is in the ellipsis in the quotation in note 68 above). But B is now supported by P^{46c}. Moreover, Hort's claim that B's reading makes "excellent sense" causes one to wonder whether, for precisely that reason, a Greek scribe and Clement might not have come up with το μη independently.

Similarly, the agreement of B cop^{samss} eth^{ro} (eth^{pp} has the usual order) at He 9:2-4 in placing τὸ χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον in the πρώτη σκηνή, might be seen as the textually-related remains of a reading current in Egypt and Ethiopia. However, the "correction" here is so easy that it could be made independently. (Cf. Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, p. 130, and Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 667.)

A related reading in our papyri is P^{66}'s addition at Jn 21:6, where one may doubt to what extent the versional support (and perhaps even the readings in Greek) might be the result of coincidental assimilation to Lk 5:5.

[92] See the fuller discussion in Chapter VII below.

[93] As far as I can see, Colwell does not explicitly discuss this aspect of his collations. But it is clear that he ignores corrections generally; cf. note 88 above. A number of cases where Colwell cites a reading before correction will be noted in Chapters II, V, and VII below.

[94] Colwell and others have thus gone wrong especially in their conclusions regarding P^{66}; see Chapter V below.

[95] Cf. Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 53: "Corrections by the original scribe, or by a contemporary reviser, where they can be satisfactorily distinguished, must be regarded as a portion of the testimony of the manuscript itself, inasmuch as every carefully prepared copy was reviewed and compared (ἀντεβλήθη), if not by the writer himself, by a skilful person appointed for the task (ὁ διορθῶν, ὁ διορθωτής), whose duty it was to amend manifest errors, ..."

I believe that Scrivener is correct in holding that the proper method would be also to ignore readings which had been corrected immediately by a διορθωτής before the manuscript was, as it were, "published." (See Metzger, *Text*, p. 15.) What we would have then would be simply another case of a "complex scribe," where the contributions of the scribe and the corrector together make up the transition from the *Vorlage* to the finished copy. Indeed, even when we can distinguish the hands of the scribe and the διορθωτής, they should be taken as forming only one entity for textual purposes, since the readings which existed in the manuscript but were immediately corrected can have had no influence on textual history. (I think it is clear that later scribes would be unlikely to utilize very many of the original readings which had been corrected.) Thus, the scribe and the διορθωτής are a unit just as are the scribe of *b* and the scribe of *a* in the example on pp. 36-38 above.

In fact, though, there is no reason to suppose that any of our six papyri was examined by a διορθωτής, and so this further issue is not relevant to the present study.

[96] In some cases, of course, it may not be possible to discriminate with confidence between corrections by the scribe and corrections by a later hand. (This is especially true of deletions by dots or crossing out.) Fortunately, there are only comparatively few corrections in our six papyri which are clearly by later hands, while many are clearly by the scribe. Consequently, I have followed the scholarly consensus in taking almost all of the corrections in these documents to be by the original scribes. For further discussion and references see Chapters II-VII below.

Later corrections are, by the way, perhaps more likely to be taken from another *Vorlage*, but even the check by the scribe or a διορθωτῆς may have been made with a second *Vorlage*. In fact, several papyri found at Oxyrhynchus have explicit indications of this kind of control; see E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 93 and n. 55. And in this fashion may have arisen some of the textual contamination of the New Testament (*ibid*., pp. 125-26).

[97] See Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, pp. 110-11. On vowel changes generally within the New Testament, see Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, translated and edited by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), §§ 22-28. (References to this work are to the paragraphs, which are constant from the ninth German edition on, and will henceforth use the abbreviation 'BDF.' I have cited this volume instead of Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, bearbeitet von Friedrich Rehkopf [14th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976], since the latter edition [see p. V] dispenses with most of the references to variations within the manuscripts [including the papyri up to P^{66}]. Cf. Kilpatrick, Review of *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, by Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, bearbeitet von Friedrich Rehkopf, and *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief als Beitrag zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen*, by Walter Bujard, in *Novum Testamentum*, 20 [1978], pp. 332-33.)

These and many other orthographic matters are treated in Francis Thomas Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Vol. I: *Phonology*, Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità, Vol. LV (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1975), the only volume so far published. Gignac's work is "based upon all the non-literary papyri and ostraca from Roman and Byzantine Egypt" (p. 49), and gives extensive references to possible Coptic influences (see pp. 46-48). Accordingly, I shall refer frequently to Gignac's volume as providing the most useful survey of the phonological and orthographic factors at work in Egypt during the period within which our six papyri were written. For the ει/ι confusion, see pp. 189-91 (p. 189: "There is a very frequent interchange of ει and ι (whether long or short etymologically) in all phonetic environments throughout the Roman and Byzantine periods."); for the αι/ε confusion, see pp. 191-93 (p. 192: "This is the most frequent interchange in the papyri next to the interchange of ει and ι."); and for the οι/υ confusion, see pp. 197-99 (p. 197: "This is the most frequent interchange in the papyri next to the interchanges of ει with ι and of αι with ε.").

For the New Testament in particular, one may compare Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, pp.83; von Soden, *Text*, p. XX; and Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, pp. 157-62.

[98] Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 110: "But lest it be too easily assumed that the recorded divergences are only the 'regular' spelling for the scribe in question, note that every word in a particular papyrus [i.e., P^{45}, P^{66}, P^{75}] which is spelled in divergence from Tischendorf is also spelled in agreement with Tischendorf in the same papyrus."

[99] *Ibid.*

[100] Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, pp. 43-44: "Neque id quod dictum est tantum ambitum habet ut etiam manifestos errores quoslibet (quorum in numero minime formae liberioris legis grammaticae ponuntur) aut quae leviter scriptura differunt universa Tischendorfius adnotaverit:.... ." Cf. also von Soden, *Text*, pp. XIX-XXI. It is clear that Nestle-Aland follows the same practice, although there seems to be no explicit statement to that effect in the 26th edition; however, the 25th edition has such a statement: Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, and Kurt Aland, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963), p. 4* n. 4 (= p. 39* n. 4 = p. 60* n. 4). (This note seems to go back to the 17th edition of 1941.)

[101] Cf. "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 110 ("More than 635"), p. 111 ("more than 600"), and further on p. 111, where the exact figure of 635 seems to follow as the difference of 1649 and 1014. However, Colwell does not define precisely what he counts as "itacism," and indeed includes 16 cases of ο/ω interchange (p. 111). Furthermore, he is counting uncorrected readings and using, of course, his definition of "singular."

[102] Cf. BDF, §20, and Gignac, Grammar, pp. 114-16 (p. 114: "Without observable pattern it is used or omitted in pausa, . . . before a word beginning with a consonant, . . . and before a word beginning with a vowel, . . ."). For the New Testament in particular see Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, Vol. III, pp. 97-99; von Soden, Text, p. XXI; Westcott and Hort, Appendix, pp. 153-55; and the statement in the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland cited in note 100 above.

[103] See the statement by Epp, "Clarification," p. 169: "Mere orthographic differences, particularly itacisms and nu-movables (as well as abbreviations) are 'insignificant' as here defined; they cannot be utilized in any decisive way for establishing manuscript relationships, and they are not substantive in the search for the original text. Again, the exception might be the work of a slavish scribe, whose scrupulousness might be considered useful in tracing manuscript descent, but the pervasive character of itacism, for example, over wide areas and time-spans precludes the 'significance' of orthographic differences for this important text-critical task."

Some of this material is, of course, noted in the prefaces to the editions of the papyri and in the standard reference works.

[104] I have regularly cited Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, Vol. III, pp. 71-99; Westcott and Hort, Appendix, pp. 150-62; BDF, §§8-42; and Gignac, Grammar.

[105] Many genuinely different words vary from one another by what in other cases would be considered a "merely orthographic" difference; cf. Ac 15:21b and Ac 17:12c in P^{45}. Some such readings will, in fact, be nonsense in context readings, as is the former.

[106] Cf. Epp, "Clarification," p. 169. These will be "significant singulars."

[107] A typical example is the common confusion of first and second aorist forms. Cf. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, pp. 116-24; Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, pp. 163-80; and BDF, §§43-125. Such readings will also be "significant singulars."

[108] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 111. Cf. also Colwell, "Classifying and Evaluating," *Studies*, p. 101 (the nonsense reading is "that variant reading which does not make sense, and/or cannot be found in the lexicon, and/or is not Greek grammar"), and Epp, "Clarification," p. 168 (the nonsense reading "is a reading that fails to make sense because it cannot be construed grammatically, either in terms of grammatical/lexical forms or in terms of grammatical structure, or because in some other way it lacks a recognizable meaning").

[109] We will see examples of this in the chapters below. Cf. Epp, "Clarification," p. 170: "Nonsense singular readings should be treated (and classified) as nonsense readings in general, for they will contribute almost nothing to text-critical study, except perhaps a general insight as to the carefulness-carelessness of a particular scribe."

[110] Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, pp. 115-16. Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 59, also discusses such confusions as one category of "sheer mistakes and slips of the pen": "Mechanical reproduction. A variation can often be explained as the substitution of a common sequence of letters for a rarer one."

[111] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 111, speaks of "Sensible Singular Readings." Epp, on the other hand, classifies all "singular readings" as "insignificant readings," since they are insignificant "for the broad tasks of New Testament textual criticism, including the determination of a manuscript's relationship with all other manuscripts, the location of a manuscript within the textual history and transmission of the New Testament, and the ultimate goal of establishing the original text" ("Clarification," p. 167; see the entire section on pp. 167-72). However, Epp (see p. 154 [quoted in note 50 above] and pp. 167-68) allows this other meaning to "significant," and indeed says (p. 170): "Singular readings that make sense, including certain orthographic differences, scribal corrections, harmonizations, and various alterations of a historical, descriptive, ideological, theological, or generally editioral [*sic* for editorial] nature, will aid in understanding the

particular manuscript under consideration, both in terms of the habits of its scribe and in terms of any stylistic peculiarities or ideological biases."

Furthermore, Epp divides his "insignificant readings" into the four classes of "singular readings," "nonsense readings," "orthographic differences," and "clear and demonstrable scribal errors." Since the present study is devoted to singular readings, our terminology of "orthographic singulars" and "nonsense singulars" seems to be the natural one. Moreover, Epp's rubric of "clear and demonstrable scribal errors" is, in effect, utilized below as we categorize various types of "significant singulars." In fact, I believe that the isolation of this group of readings logically presupposes the sort of study undertaken here, since the group "is comprised of readings that can be construed grammatically and make sense but can be demonstrated with reasonable certainty to be scribal errors" (p. 169). Such a demonstration requires, of course, the "knowledge of documents" which should arise from a study of singular readings.

[112] Among the first few singulars of P^{45}, see Mt.25:43b, 25:44, 26:6a, 26:21a, etc.

[113] Cf., again from P^{45}, Mt 26:5, 26:6b, 26:12, Mk 6:19, etc. Similar cases with several such scattered readings are, in P^{45}, Mt 20:31a, Mk 7:33b, 8:20, etc.

[114] See, in P^{45}, Mk 7:33c, although here the external evidence is overwhelming for one reading.

[115] Given, for example, the close relationship between P^{75} and B, one will not often go wrong by simply taking the reading of B as that of the Vorlage of P^{75}.

[116] In P^{45} such cases may be Lk 9:37 and Ac 13:33. But, as we shall see in the next chapter, we may still be able to say something about what the scribe did, whatever his Vorlage read. In the case of Ac 13:33, for example, it seems clear that the scribe has simply introduced an easier reading in order to avoid the textual difficulty there.

[117] Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 109: "In other cases the complex nature of the attestation and the difficulty of identifying the unit of variation made decisions difficult and statistics only approximately accurate. But no major conclusion of this study depends upon an absolutely exact tabulation."

[118] That is, as far as possible. Some particular doubtful readings are discussed in detail below. Again, though, such uncertainties are comparatively rare.

[119] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 124.

CHAPTER II

THE SCRIBE OF P^{45}

P^{45} is a third century[1] codex which once formed a complete edition of the four Gospels and Acts.[2] More or less well preserved fragments of thirty folios are known as Chester Beatty Papyrus I and are now in Dublin.[3] Portions of the second of these folios have been found in Vienna, and are listed as Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Pap. Vindob. Graec. 31974.[4] Of the thirty folios, two contain parts of Matthew, six parts of Mark, seven parts of Luke, two parts of John, and thirteen parts of Acts.[5]

The manuscript's text of Mark has been described as Caesarean, where P^{45} agrees most closely with W of the major uncials.[6] In the other Gospels--where the Caesarean text is not identifiable--P^{45} fails to side clearly with any of the major manuscripts or text-types.[7] In Acts the text is closer to the Alexandrian text (ℵ A B C) than to the Western (D it), and Kenyon notes that P^{45} "has none of the major variants characteristic of the text of D in Acts," even though "it does contain a certain number of the minor variants for which the evidence has hitherto been 'Western' in character."[8]

The writing of P^{45} is clear and careful, with very few lapsus calami or corrections. Kenyon notes: "The writing is very correct, and though without calligraphic pretensions, is the work of a competent scribe."[9] The use of abbreviations for nomina sacra is frequent, but the use of breathings and punctuation is, as would be expected in a papyrus of such antiquity, sparse.[10]

The only listing of singular readings of P^{45} available appears to be that present in Kenyon's apparatus,[11] that is, those readings for which he cites no support from Greek manuscripts. (This list--if it can be so designated--is utilized by most later researchers.) Unfortunately, Kenyon's notes are neither exhaustive nor entirely accurate,[12] and his printed readings of the papyrus are occasionally in error. Our list of singulars was established from Kenyon's plates of P^{45},[13] supplemented by Zuntz's photographs of Pap. Vindob. Graec. 31974 and reconstruction of folio 2. Relying on known textual affinities, we also examined W, Θ, 892, and 1241 at the readings of P^{45} with no Greek manuscript support in Tischendorf; this check enabled us to delete (by asterisks) five readings from our list,[14] and also made it possible to correct a few citations. Since P^{45} is the only one of our six papyri for which Legg's editions are relevant, his material was also consulted, but only one reading was thereby deleted.[15] P^{66} and P^{75} were also checked, but no reading was thereby deleted.[16]

The results were compared with Kenyon's apparatus, and any discrepancies were checked again.[17] The final list of P^{45}'s singulars, then, is as follows:

Matthew

20:31a μειζον ς rell : [πολ]λ̣ω P^{45} : μειζονα 952 1579 1588 : μειζονως 1424 : πολλω μαλλον ℵ : πλεον U
20:31b εκραυγαζον Θ Φ f^{13} : ε̣κραυγασαν̣ P^{45} : εκραζον ς C N W Π^2 f^1 rell : εκραξαν ℵ B D L Z Π^1 085 700 892 pc
** 25:43a γυμνος ς rell : και γυμνος P^{45} Θ syr Tatian
25:43b γυμνος ς rell : γυμνος ημ[ην] P^{45} it^{h,r^2}
25:44 η quint ς rell : και P^{45}
26:1 ο ιησους παντας ante τους ς rell (E Γ f^{13pt} 124* 157 544 565 al om παντας) : ο ι̅[η̅ (= ιησους) παντας] post τουτους P^{45}
26:5 ινα μη ς rell : μ[η] P^{45} it^h : μηποτε L 700
26:6a του δε ιησου γενομενου ς rell : τωι δ[ε ι̅η̅ (= ιησου) γενομενωι] P^{45}
26:6b λεπρου ς rell : λεγομεν[ου λεπρου] P^{45} : λεπρωσου D*
** 26:7 αλαβαστρον μυρου εχουσα ς pm : [αλαβασ]τρον εχουσα μυρου P^{45} 157 pc
26:12 τουτο post μυρον ς rell : [τουτο] post εποι[ησεν] P^{45vid} pr sp : τουτο ante το pri 253 1295 1402 2145 : om τουτο 243
26:21a αυτων ς rell : om P^{45vid} pr sp
** 26:21b οτι ς rell : om P^{45} P^{37} 241 245 566 1402 1555

Matthew

**	26:23	ο δε ς rell : [ο δε ι̅η̅ (= ιησους)] P^{45vid} pr sp f^{13}
**	26:31	εν εμοι ς pm : om P^{45vid} pr sp 69 242 1093
**	26:33	αυτω ς rell : om P^{45vid} pr sp P^{37} 517 700 954 1424 1675 it^{b,c,ff^2} syr^{s} $cop^{sa^{ms}}$
**	26:36	ο ιησους ς rell : om P^{45vid} pr sp 1295 cop^{bo}

Mark

	5:21	εις το περαν ς rell : om P^{45} $it^{(c),f}$
	6:17	γυναικα post την ς rell : γυν[αικα] post αυτου P^{45}
	6:19	η δε ηρωδιας ς rell : η̣ ηρ̣ωδιας δε P^{45} : ο ηρωδης 1194 1207
	6:21	τοις pri ς rell : εν το̣ις̣ P^{45}
**	6:24	ειπεν sec ς pm : [ειπεν αιτ]ησαι P^{45} W
	6:37	αυτοις sec ante υμεις ς rell : αυτοις sec post [φαγει]ν pri P^{45} : αυτοις sec post υμεις 713
**	6:39a	παντας ς pm : om P^{45} 700 827
**	6:39b	τω ς rell : om P^{45} 122
	6:40	κατα (ℵ B D 21 565, ανδρες W, ανα ς rell) εκατον και κατα (ℵ B D 21 565, om f^{13pt} 33 pc, ανα ς rell) πεντηκοντα ς rell : om P^{45}
	6:41a	πεντε ς rell : om P^{45}
	6:41b	δυο pri ς rell : om P^{45}

Mark

6:48a φυλακην της νυκτος ς rell :
[της νυκτος] φυλακην P^{45vid} pr sp

6:48b ηθελεν ς rell : [ηλ]θεν P^{45} :
ηθελησεν D : ηθλεν 565

6:49 επι της θαλασσης ς rell : om P^{45vid} pr sp

7:5 κοιναις χερσιν ℵ* B Θ f^{1} 33 579 700 pc :
κοιναις χερσιν και ανιπτο[ις] P^{45} : κοιναις
χερσιν ανιπτοις f^{13} : ανιπτοις χερσιν ς $\aleph^{c}$
rell : κοιναις ταις χερσιν D W 28 565

7:8 παραδοσιν ς rell : εντολην P^{45}

** 7:15 εξωθεν ς rell : εξω P^{45} 245 517 827 1675

** 7:25 το ς rell : om P^{45} f^{13} 28

7:28 υποκατω ς rell : τα υποκατω P^{45} :
αποκατω ℵ*

(o) 7:33a κατ ς rell : καθ P^{45}

7:33b εβαλεν ς $\aleph^{c}$ rell : ενεβαλεν P^{45} it^{c} :
ελαβεν ℵ* : επεβαλεν f^{13} : εβαλλε 157 pc

7:33c πτυσας (vel πτυσσας) ante ηψατο ς rell :
πτυσας ante και sec P^{45} : πτυσας ante
εβαλεν D : πτυσας post εβαλεν Θ 565 :
πτυσας ante εις W f^{13} 28 :
πτυσας post γλωσσης αυτου 124

7:35 ελυθη ο δεσμος ς rell : [ο δεσμος] ε̣λ̣υθη
P^{45vid} pr sp

Mark

8:10 μαγεδα D^{2} (-γαιδα) 28 565 it^{c,k} :
[μαγε]δ̣α̣ν̣ P^{45vid} it^{a,aur,d} syr^{s} (magedam
it$^{b,i,ff^{2},r^{1}}$) : μαγδαλα θ f^{1} f^{13} pc :
μελεγαδα D* : δαλμανουθα ς pm :
δαλμανουνθα B : δαλμουναι W

8:12a ζητει σημειον ℵ B C D L Δ θ^{c} (θ* σημων) f^{1} 28
33 565 579 700 892 pc (transp 21 372 1241 pc) :
σημειον επιζητει ς rell (transp 22 872) :
σημειον αιτει P^{45}

** 8:12b λεγω υμιν ς pm : om P^{45} W

** 8:16 και ς rell : οι δε̣ P^{45} W 565

** 8:17 διαλογιζεσθε ς pm : διαλογιζεσθε εν
εαυτοις ολιγοπιστοι P^{45} W

8:20 πληρωματα κλασματων ς rell : [κλασματων
π]λ̣ηρωματα P^{45vid} pr sp : πληρωματων
κλασματων E* 71 692 : κλασματων D :
κλασματων πληρεις Δ θ 565 700 :
πληρωματα W 291 1241

** 8:38a ταυτη ς rell : om P^{45} W it^{a,i,k,n}

** 8:38b μετα ς rell : και P^{45} W syr^{s}

** 9:2a κατ ς rell : καθ P^{45} W

** 9:2b μετεμορφωθη ς pm : μετεμορφωθη ο̣ $\overline{\text{ιης}}$
(= ιησους) P^{45} W f^{13}

Mark

9:3 επι της γης ante ου ς rell : επι της γης post δ̣υναται P^{45} : επι της γης post λευκαναι D

** 9:5 ο πετρος λεγει ς pm : [ει]π̣εν πετρος P^{45} W

** 9:6 λαληση (vel -σει) ς pm : λαλει P^{45} W

9:7 μου post υιος ς rell : μ[ου] post [ου]τ̣ος P^{45}

** 9:8 ουκετι ς rell : om $P^{45vid\ pr\ sp}$ 225 565 pc

** 9:19 λεγει ς pm : ο $\overline{ιη}$ (= ιησους) ειπεν P^{45} θ 565 it^{aur}

** 9:25 τω ακαθαρτω ς rell : om P^{45} W f^1 syr^s

9:28a εισελθοντος αυτου ℵ B C D L W Δ Θ Ψ f^1 f^{13} 28 372 700 892 1071 1654 : εισελθοντα αυτον ς rell (273 om αυτον) : εισελθοντι αυτωι P^{45} : ελθοντα αυτον Ν Σ pc : ελθοντος αυτου 565

9:28b εις οικον ς rell : om $P^{45vid\ pr\ sp}$: εις τον οικον A M al : εις την οικιαν 38 1573

9:28c προσηλθον αυτω οι μαθηται αυτου (om W) κατ ιδιαν και (W Θ f^{13} 700 επ-) ηρωτησαν αυτον λεγοντες W Θ f^{13} 28 565 (επηρωτων) 700 : προσηλθον ο̣ι̣ μ̣[αθηται αυτου κατ ιδιαν αυτ]ωι και ηρωτησαν αυτον λεγοντε[ς] P^{45vid} : (cont.)

Mark

9:28c οι μαθηται αυτου κατ ιδιαν επηρωτων
(επερωτουν C 579) αυτον ℵ B C* L Δ 33 579
892 1071 1241 pc : οι μαθηται αυτου κατ ιδιαν
ηρωτων αυτον D f^{1} 1355 : οι μαθηται αυτου
επηρωτων (επερωτουν C) αυτον κατ ιδιαν ς C^{3} pm

11:27 και ερχονται (ερχεται D X 544 565) παλιν (om
F Φ 544 1574) εις (add τα 237) ιεροσολυμα και
εν τω ιερω περιπατουντος αυτου ερχονται ς
rell : και ερ̣[χονται] P^{45vid}

** 11:29 επερωτησω ς pm : [επερ]ωτω P^{45} W it$^{a,aur,b,c,f,ff^2,i,k,l}$

12:14 δωμεν η μη δωμεν ς rell : [δω]μεν ουν η [μη
δω]μεν P^{45} : om D 1346 : δωμεν 225 1424 pc

** 12:19 αδελφος αυτου ς rell : [αδελφος]
P$^{45vid\ pr\ sp}$ W 1542 it^{b}

12:26 ο (om D W f^{13pt}) θεος αβρααμ και ο (om B D W)
θεος ισαακ (ℵ^{c}, ισακ ℵ* D) και ο (om B D W)
θεος ιακωβ ς rell (1071 transp ιακωβ...ισαακ) :
[ο θ̄ς̄ (= θεος) ισαα]κ̣ και ο θ̄[ς̄ (= θεος)
ιακωβ] P^{45vid} pr sp

Luke

6:37 καταδικασθητε ς rell : κ̣α̣[ταδικ]ασθησ[εσθε]
P^{45} : δικασθητε P^{75} B 280

Luke

9:30 συνελαλουν ς rell : συνλαλουντ̣[ες] P^{45}
syr^{c,s} : συλλαλουν E* (Tischendorf:
scripturus erat συλλαλουντες?) : ελαλουν 579

9:31 εμελλεν ς rell (ημ- P^{75} ℵ A C N W Θ 1071) :
εμελλον P^{45} : μελλει D

9:32 διαγρηγορησαντες δε ς rell :
διεγρηγορη̣[σαν]τες δε P^{45} :
και διαγρηγορησαντες f^{1}

9:33 τον ιησουν ς rell : $\overline{\iota\eta}$ (= ιησουν) P^{45} :
τω ιησου D

** 9:36a και εν ς rell : και εγενετο εν P^{45} 1241

9:36b και αυτοι ς rell : και P^{45} : αυτοι δε D

9:37 τη εξης ημερα P^{75} ℵ B L S W f^{1} f^{13} 477 892
1071 1355 : εν τη εξης ημερα ς rell : δια
της ημερας D : της ημερας P^{45} : τη
εξης 579

** 9:48a υμιν ς rell : [υ]μ̣ω̣ν̣ P$^{45vid(?)}$ $\underline{K}^{r}$

** 9:48b μεγας ς rell : ο μεγας P^{45} 1093 cop^{sa,bo}

9:49 αυτον ς rell : om P^{45}

9:50 ος γαρ ουκ εστιν καθ υμων υπερ υμων εστιν
P^{75vid} ℵ^{cb} B C D K M W Π 565 700 1241 1424 al :
ου γαρ εστιν καθ υμων ουδε υπερ υ̣[μ]ων P^{45} :
ου γαρ εστιν καθ υμων (ημων 892 pc) ος γαρ
ουκ εστιν καθ υμων υπερ υμων εστιν L Ξ (cont.)

Luke

9:50 Ψ 33 892 pc : ος γαρ ουκ εστιν καθ ημων υπερ
ημων εστιν ς ℵ^{ca} rell : ος γαρ ουκ εστιν
καθ υμων υπερ ημων εστιν ℵ* A X (om ουκ) Δ
69 213 (om ουκ) 1047 : ος γαρ (add αν Θ)
ουκ εστιν καθ ημων υπερ υμων εστιν Θ pc

9:52 αυτου vel εαυτου ς rell : om P^{45} it^{e}

9:53a αυτου ην ς rell : ην αυτου P^{45}

9:53b πορευομενον ς rell : πορευομενου P^{45}
it^{aur,b,f,l,q} vg Ambr (euntis)

9:57 υπαγεις D 157 : υπαγης P^{45} :
απερχη ς rell : απερχει G H al

9:58 και pri ς rell : om P^{45} it^{c,e} syr

10:8 και εις ην αν P^{75} ℵ B C D W Θ rell :
εις ην δ̣ α̣ν̣ P^{45vid} : και εις ην δ αν ς A K
L X Λ Π f^{1} 21 157 1241 al : και εις αν U 1574

10:11a τον κολληθεντα ς rell : om P^{45}

** 10:11b υμων ς W^{c} rell : om P^{45} W* 892

10:11c υμιν ς rell : om P^{45} syr^{c,s}

** 10:13 οτι ει ς rell : ο̣τι̣ P^{45} W

** 10:15 εως sec ς pm:: και εως P^{45} 1574

10:16 ο αθετων υμας ς rell : ο υμας αθετ̣ων P^{45}
it$^{aur,b,c,e,f,i,q,r^{1}}$ vg Eus Const Ps-Ignatius

10:19 οφεων και σκορπιων ς rell (Θ σκοπιων) : των
οφεων και σκορ̣πι̣ω̣ν̣ P^{45} : των οφεων και των
σκορπιων D 157

Luke

10:21 και της γης ς rell : om P^{45} Mcion

10:27 εξ ολης της (om P^{75} B Ξ 0124 472) καρδιας σου και (om P^{75} B) εν ολη τη ψυχη σου και εν ολη τη ισχυι σου P^{75} ℵ B L Ξ 0124 (εξ ολης της ισχυος σου) 579 1071 (472 1241 om και εν ολη τη ισχυι σου) : om P^{45vid} : εξ ολης της καρδιας σου και εξ ολης της ψυχης σου και εξ ολης της ισχυος σου ς pm : εν ολη τη (om f^{1} 157) καρδια σου και εν ολη τη (om f^{1}) ψυχη σου και εν ολη τη (om f^{1}) ισχυι σου D f^{1} 157 (om και εν ολη τη ψυχη σου)

(n) 10:30 ιεριχω (vel ιερειχω) ς rell : ι̣ερωι P^{45}

10:31 δε ς rell : om P^{45} $it^{a,q}$

10:34a επιχεων ς rell : επιχεας P^{45}

(n) 10:34b επι ς rell : εις P^{45}

10:35 αυριον ς rell : επαυριον P^{45}

10:37 ποιει ς rell : και [π]οιει P^{45}

10:38 αυτος εισηλθεν ς rell : εισηλθεν αυτος P^{45} : αυτος ηλθεν E 477 : αυτος εισελθων 21 : αυτον εισελθειν D

10:40a μου post αδελφη ς rell : [μ]ο̣υ post $\overline{κε}$ (= κυριε) P^{45}

10:40b συναντιλαβηται ς rell : σ̣υνλαβηται P^{45} : αντιλαβητε (= -ται) D

Luke

10:41 ειπεν αυτη ο κυριος P^{3} P^{75} ℵ B* L 157 579
892 : ο κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος) [ει]πεν αυτηι P^{45} :
ειπεν αυτη ο ιησους ς A B^{3} C* P W Γ Δ Λ Ψ
rell : ο ιησους ειπεν αυτη C^{3} D K U Θ Π f^{13}
472 565 1241 pm : ειπεν αυτη 544 990

10:42 αγαθην ς rell : καλην P^{45}

(o) 11:7a δουναι ς rell : δωναι̣ P^{45}

11:7b σοι post δουναι ς rell : σοι post δυναμαι
P^{45}

11:8 εγερθεις ς rell : α̣ν̣α̣σ̣τας P^{45} :
εξεργεθεις 1675

11:11a δε ς rell : γαρ P^{45} Mcion

11:11b ο υιος ς rell : υ̅ς̣̅ (= υιος) P^{45} Mcion Or :
υιος αυτου f^{1} : ο υιος αυτου 124 472 pc : :
om L 157 892* 1241

11:12 ωον ς rell : αρτον P^{45}

** 11:13 ο εξ ουρανου ς pm : ο ουρανιος P^{45} 579 1424
l^{185} it^{1} vg^{s} Cyr

11:14 ο κωφος ς rell (D aliter) : om P^{45}

11:15 ειπον ς rell (B ειπαν) : ελαλησαν οχυροι
λεγοντες P^{45}

** 11:18 εκβαλλειν με ς pm : εκβαλλει P^{45} W pc

11:19a τα δαιμονια ς rell : om P^{45} $it^{a^{2},ff^{2},i,l,r^{1}}$

Luke

** 11:19b κριται υμων αυτοι εσονται ς pm :
αυτοι εσονται υμων κριται P^{45} 1194

(n) 11:20 ει ς rell : εν P^{45}

** 11:21 καθωπλισμενος (vel καθο-) ς rell :
καθοπλισαμενος P^{45} 1241

11:22a επελθων ς rell : επανελθων P^{45} : ελθων
P^{75} f^{13pt} 945 1241 : απελθων 477 485 1573 :
om 579

** 11:22b διαδιδωσιν ς pm : διδωσι P^{45} 1279

11:29 σημειον tert ς rell : om P^{45}

** 11:30 και ς rell : om P^{45} Ψ 16 it^{c,e} cop^{sa}

** 11:31 αυτους ς rell : αυτην P^{45} P^{75} 245 1424 it^{d}

11:32 εν ς rell : om P^{45}

11:36 μερος τι P^{75} A B G K M W X Π 0124 f^{1} f^{13} 33
472 579 1093 1241 al : μελος τι P^{45} :
τι μερος ς rell : μερος C L Γ Θ Ψ 700 pc

** 11:38 εβαπτισθη ς rell : εβαπτισα̣το P^{45} 700 it^{e}

11:42a τοις ς rell : om P^{45}

11:42b οτι ς rell : om P^{45} : οτε P^{75}

** 11:42c πηγανον ς pm : ανηθον P^{45} 157 it^{e}

11:43 ταις αγοραις ς rell : [τηι αγορ]α P^{45vid}

11:44 εστε ως ς rell : ως εστε P^{45} : εστε D

12:1a επισυναχθεισων ς rell (D aliter) :
συναχθεισων P^{45}

Luke

**	12:1b	οχλου ς rell : λαου P^{45} 579
	12:2	και κρυπτον ο ου γνωσθησεται ς rell : om P^{45}
	12:3	ειπατε ς rell : εαν ειπητε P^{45}
**	12:4	φοβηθητε ς rell : πτοηθητε P^{45} 700
	12:5	φοβηθητε tert ς rell : φοβηθηναι̣ P^{45} syr^{s}
	12:7a	της κεφαλης υμων πασαι ς rell : υμων της κεφαλης πασαι P^{45} : υμων πασαι της κεφαλης D : της κεφαλης πασαι υμων 892 1241 : της κεφαλης υμων 565*
	12:7b	ηριθμηνται ς rell : ηριθμημεναι P^{45} Cl : ηριθμημεναι εισιν D Θ 40 124 259 579 1071 pc
**	12:8a	δε ς rell : om P^{45} 267 $it^{a,b,ff^{2},i,l}$ $syr^{pal^{b}}$ cop^{sa} eth
	12:8b	εαυτον 13 69 543^{c} : αυτον P^{45} $it^{a,b,c,e,f,l,r^{1}}$ (illum vel eum) : εν αυτω ς rell : αυτω H 157 : (ομολογησει)εν αυτον 346 983 1574
**	12:9	versum om P^{45} 245 it^{e} $syr^{s,p^{ms}}$ $cop^{bo^{ms}}$
	12:11	τας συναγωγας και τας αρχας ς rell : [τ]α̣ς αρχας και τας συναγωγας P^{45}
	12:24a	τους κορακας ς rell : τα πετεινα του ουρανου κα[ι] τους κορακας P^{45} (cfr. $Or^{1,771}$ [Tischendorf ad Mt 6:25]) : τα πετεινα του ουρανου D $it^{d,e,(f),l,r^{1}}$
	12:24b	αποθηκη ς rell : αποθηκαι P^{45} syr

Luke

12:27 πασῃ ς rell : om P^{45}

12:28a εν αγρω τον χορτον οντα σημερον P^{75} ℵ B L 579 892 1241 (σημερον οντα) : τον χορτον (add του αγρου f^{1pt} f^{13pt}) σημερον εν (add τω K Π Ψ f^{13} al) αγρω οντα A K M Q U W Θ Π Ψ 070 f^{1} f^{13} 33 472 1047 1604 al : τον χορτον εν τω (om Λ 71) αγρω σημερον οντα ς pm (οντα σημερον Λ pc) : εν αγρωι σημερον τον χορτον οντα P^{45} : τον χορτον του αγρου σημερον οντα D G^{supp} H X 16 1424 pc

12:28b ποσω ς rell : ποσω ουν P^{45} syr^{c} : ου πολλω 1555 : πολλω 579

** 12:33 εγγιζει ς pm : ενγιζει P^{45} W

12:36a και κρουσαντος (add αυτου A 251 716 1241) ευθεως ς rell : ε̣υ̣θεως κ[αι κρουσαντος] P^{45}

12:36b αυτω ς rell : om P$^{45vid\ pr\ sp}$: αυτον Γ 28 157 713

12:47 μη ετοιμασας η ποιησας P^{75} ℵ B Ψ 070 33 579 892 1241 : μη ετοιμασας μηδε ποιησας ς rell : ποιησας P^{45} : μη ποιησας D 69 : μη ποιησας μηδε ετοιμασας 1093 1675* :: μη ετοιμαση (-σει 1216) ποιησας 348 1216 1279 : μη ετοιμασας L W f^{13} 330

Luke

12:48 πολυ ζητηθησεται ϛ rell (D aliter) : ζητηθησεται πολυ P^{45} : πολυ sec post αυτου 1241

12:51 εν τη γη ϛ rell : επι της γης P^{45} : επι την γην 157 1093 1424 : τη γη 267 291 1574

(n) 12:52a εσονται ϛ rell : εσται P^{45}

12:52b γαρ ϛ rell : om P^{45}

12:52c πεντε εν οικω ενι ϛ rell : εν οικωι ενι πεντε P^{45} : πεντε εν ενι οικω P^{75} ℵ B L 579 (om εν) 892 1071 1241 : εν ενι οικω πεντε D

** 12:53 πατηρ εφ (vel επι) υιω και υιος επι πατρι ϛ pm : υ̅ς̅ (= υιος) επι π̅ρ̅ι̅ (= πατρι) κ[αι] π̅ρ̅ (= πατηρ) επι υ̅ω̅ (= υιω) P^{45} 157

12:55 πνεοντα ϛ rell : πνεοντα ιδ[η]τε P^{45} it$^{b,e,f,ff^{2},i,l,q}$: πνευοντα P^{75} : πλεοντα D 1194

12:58a επ (επι Θ 1047) αρχοντα ϛ rell : επι τον αρχοντα P^{45}

** 12:58b φυλακην ϛ rell : τ[η]ν φυλακην P^{45} Ω 157 245 700

** 13:8 αυτω ϛ rell : om P$^{45\text{vid pr sp}}$ 157 1093 it$^{r^{1}}$

13:10 εν μια των συναγωγων τοις σαββασιν Ψ 070 f^{1} f^{13Pt} : τοις σαββασιν εν μια τ̣[ων συν]α[γ]ωγω̣ν̣ P^{45} : εν μια των συναγωγων εν τοις σαββασιν ϛ rell : εν μια των συναγωγων τω σαββατω D : εν μια των ημερων εν τοις σαββασιν H (cont.)

Luke

13:10 579 : εν μια των ημερων και των συναγωγων τοις σαββασιν f^{13pt}

13:12 ο ιησους ς rell : om P^{45} it^{b,i}

** 13:15a απεκριθη ουν et και pri ς pm : απ[ο]κριθεις δε et om και pri P^{45} 28 1424 pc it$^{a,aur,c,f,ff^2,i,r^1}$

13:15b τον βουν αυτου ς rell (1573 pon αυτου post ονον) : αυτου τον βουν P^{45}

13:22 και tert ς rell : την P^{45} : om 1200

13:24 εισελθειν δια της στενης θυρας P^{75} ℵ B D L Θ f^{1} 892 990 1241 : [δια] τ̣ης στενης θυρας εισελθ̣ε̣[ιν] P^{45} : εισελθειν δια της στενης πυλης ς rell : εισελθειν δια της θυρας στηνης πυλης 070

13:30 εισιν sec ς rell (εσονται X) : om P^{45} it^{e} syr^{c,s}

** 13:31 θελει σε ς pm : σε θελει P^{45} P^{75} W it^{aur}

13:32a επιτελω ς rell : αποτελω P^{75} ℵ B L 33 124 1241 pc : ποιουμαι P^{45} : αποτελουμαι D : τελω 998 1675

13:32b σημερον ς rell : και σημερον P^{45} syr^{p}

** 14:1 σαββατω ς rell : εν σαββατωι P^{45} Θ it^{e}

Luke

14:5a υιος P^{75} A B S U V W Δ pm (ο υιος A S U 700) :
η υιος P^{45} : ονος ς ℵ K L X Π Ψ f^{1} f^{13} (69
ορος) 33 157 579 892 1241 al : ονος υιος Θ :
προβατον D

14:5b ουκ ευθεως ς rell : ευθεως ου[κ] P^{45}

14:8a κατακλιθης ς rell : [κατα]κλειυου P^{45} :
κλιθης 245 : κλιθη 047 69 124

14:8b υπ αυτου ς ℵ^{a} rell : om P^{45} it$^{a,b,c,ff^{2},i,l,}$
q,r^{1} syr^{s,p} cop^{bo} eth : αυτου ℵ* L : ηξει
pro η κεκλημενος υπ αυτου D

14:20 εγημα ς rell : ηγαμησα P^{45vid} : ελαβον D

14:23a φραγμους ς rell : τους φραγμους P^{45}

** 14:28b αναγκασον ς rell : ποιησο[ν] P^{45} 157 syr^{c,s}

** 14:29 αυτω ς pm : om P^{45} 892

14:31 ουχι ς rell : ου P^{45} : ουκ ευθεως D

John

10:11a ο ποιμην ο καλος pri ς rell :
ο καλος ποι[μην] P^{45}

10:11b ο ποιμην ο καλος sec ς rell :
ο καλος ποιμην P^{45}

** 10:12 τα προβατα ιδια ς pm : ιδια τα προβατα P^{45}
Θ it^{b}

John

10:14 γεινωσκουσι με τα εμα P^{45*} P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D^{c} (εμε pro με) L W pc : γεινωσκει με τα εμα P^{45c} : Epiph (τα εμα προβατα γινωσκει με) : γινωσιν εμε τα εμα D* : γινωσκομαι υπο των εμων ς rell

10:15 καθως ς rell : και καθως P^{45}

10:16 α ς rell : απερ P^{45}

10:18a παλιν post εχω sec ς rell : παλιν ante εξου[σιαν] sec P^{45} Or Eus : om παλιν 64 80 225

10:18b την εντολην ελαβον ς rell : ελαβον [ε]ντολην P^{45} : εντολην ελαβον B θ

10:22 χειμων P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D G L W X θ Π Ψ 1 33 565 579 892^{supp} pc : χειμων δε P^{45} : και χειμων ς rell

** 10:31 εβασταςαν ουν παλιν ς pm : εβαστασ̣α̣ν P^{45} θ $it^{aur,ff^{2}}$ $vg^{st,mss}$ arm

10:34-5 εν τω νομω et λυθηναι η γραφη ς rell : [εν τη]ι γραφηι εν τωι νομωι et λυθηναι P^{45}

10:35 προς ους ο λογος του θεου εγενετο ς rell (D εγενετο ante του) : om P^{45}

10:36 υιος ς rell : ο $\overline{υς}$̣ (= υιος) P^{45} (P^{75} ?)

John

10:39 εζητουν P^{75vid} B E G H M S^{vid} U Γ Θ Λ Ω 28
565 700 1093 pm : εζητουν δε P^{45} it^{f} :
εζητουν ουν ς P^{66} ℵ A K L W X Δ Π pm :
και εζητουν D

11:1 βηθανιας ς rell : βηθανιαμ P^{45} it^{b}

11:2a μαρια ς rell (μαριαμ P^{6vid} B 33) : αυτη η
μαρ[ια] P^{45} it^{e} $syr^{s,p}$: αυτη μαρια X

11:2b λαζαρος ς rell : λ̣αζαρ P^{45} : om 983 1689

11:4 του θεου sec ς rell : αυτου P^{45} $it^{c,ff^2,l}$
cop^{sa,ach^2} syr^{s} Ambr : του ανθρωπου 0250 :
om P^{66}

11:7 τοις μαθηταις ς P^{6vid} P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ B L W X Θ
Ψ 0250 f^{1} pm : om P^{45} $it^{e,l}$: τοις μαθηταις
αυτου A D K Γ Δ Λ Π f^{13} 28 1010 al :
αυτοις P^{66*} arm

11:9 περιπατη (vel -τει) εν τη (om V 1093 1219)
ημερα ς rell : [εν τηι] η̣μερα περιπατη P^{45} :
περιπατη εν τω φωτι X 213 : περιπατη την
ημεραν 1355

** 11:22 αιτηση vel αιτησει ς rell : αιτη̣σης P^{45} P^{66}
W pc

11:25a και η ζωη ς rell : om P^{45} it^{l} syr^{s} Or Cyp Tit

11:25b ζησεται ς rell : [ζη]σ̣ει P^{45}

John

** 11:30 εν ς rell : επι P^{45} P^{66} θ f^{13} pc

11:31 υπαγει εις το μνημειον ς rell : [εις το
μνη]μειο[ν υ]παγει P^{45}

** 11:32 ιδουσα ς rell : [και] ιδουσα P^{45vid} P^{66} :
ιδουσα δε W

11:43 εξω ς rell : ε̣λ̣θ̣ε̣ εξω P^{45vid}

11:44 περιεδεδετο ς rell : εδ[ε]δ̣ετο P^{45} $\text{it}^{a,aur,}$
c,d,e,[r^{1}] vg : περιδεδετο D* :
περιδεδεμενος θ (et τιν [pro την] οψιν)

11:45 πολλοι ουν ς rell : πολ[λο]ι P^{45} $\text{syr}^{pal^{b}}$:
πολλοι δε ℵ cop^{sa} $\text{syr}^{s,p,h,pal^{a,c}}$

11:51 του ενιαυτου εκεινου ς rell : om P^{45} $\text{it}^{e,l}$
syr^{s} : του ενιαυτου P^{66} D

11:57 φαρισαιοι ς rell : πρεσ[βυτεροι] P^{45vid}

Acts

4:30 την χειρα σου εκτεινειν ℵ^{c} D E Ψ 33 181 242
322 323 462 1739 al : [ε]κτεινειν την χειρα
σο[υ] P^{45} : την χειρα σου εκτεινειν σε ς ℵ*
P al : την χειρα σε εκτεινειν P^{74} A 1175 pc :
την χειρα εκτεινειν σε B

4:31 του αγιου πνευματος ℵ A B D 242 1175 1739 :
πνευματος αγιου ς rell : του $\overline{\text{πνς}}$ (=
πνευματος) του αγ[ι]ου P^{45}

(a) 4:32 τι ς rell : τις P^{45} : om D 460* 2495*

Acts

5:13 αλλ εμεγαλυνεν αυτους (add πας 257) ο λαος ς rell : om P^{45}

5:17 σαδδουκαιων ς rell : σανδου[καιων] P^{45}

5:34 τους ανθρωπους ante ποιησαι ℵ A B 5 452 614 : τους ανθρωπους post [ποιησ]α̣ι P^{45} : τους αποστολους (pro τους ανθρωπους) ante ποιησαι ς pm : τους αποστολους ante εξω D : τους αποστολους ante βραχυ 0142 3 440 642 1838 pc

5:36 γαρ ς rell : om P^{45}

5:38 εξ ανθρωπων η βουλη ς rell : η βουλη̣ [εξ ανθρωπων] P^{45}

(n) 7:12 τους π̅[ς̅ (= πατερας)] $P^{45c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : του π̅[ς̅ (= πατρος)] P^{45*}

7:34 νυν ς rell : om P^{45} : νυνι C^2

** 7:39 εις αιγυπτον post αυτων ς rell : [εις] α̣[ι]γ̣υπ̣τ̣ο̣ν̣ ante ε̣ν̣ P^{45} 623

7:41 εκειναις ς rell : om P^{45vid} pr sp

7:58a και οι ς rell (1898 om οι μαρτυρες) : [οι] δε̣ P^{45}

7:58b σαυλου ς rell : σαουλ P^{45}

** 7:60 τουτο ς rell : τ̣α̣υτα P^{45} 209

** 8:17a τας χειρας post επετιθουν (vel -θεσαν vel -θοσαν vel -θεισαν) ς rell : [τας χειρας] ante [και] P^{45} 547

** 8:17b επ αυτους ς rell : αυτοις P^{45} 257

Acts

8:24 μηδεν ς rell : μη̣δ̣ε εν P^{45} : μη 36 307 1838

** 8:36 ιδου υδωρ ς rell : om P^{45} 1245

9:18a ανεβλεψεν τε ς rell (C* latet) : και ανεβλεψεν P^{45} it vg : ανεβλεψεν δε ℵ C^2 181 1898

9:18b και αναστας ς rell : αν̣[αστας δε] P^{45vid}

9:19a ενισχυθη B C* 242 322 323 424** 467 945 1108 1175 1611 1739 1891 2298 : ενισχυσθη P^{45} : ενισχυσεν ς P^{74} C^2 pm

9:19b τινας ς rell : ικανας P^{45} it^h (plurimos)

** 9:21 οι ακουοντες ς rell : om P^{45vid} pr sp P^{74} Ψ* 642

9:24 σαυλω ς rell : σαουλ P^{45} : παυλω H 81* (?) 257

9:38 λυδδα $ℵ^c$ A : λυδδας ℵ* B* C 81 623* 915 1175 pc : λ̣υνδα P^{45} : λυδδης ς B^3 rell

9:39a ανηγαγον ς rell : ηγαγ̣ο̣ν̣ P^{45}

9:39b εποιει ς rell : εποιησεν P^{45}

9:39c μετ αυτων ς rell : αυταις μ̣ε̣τ α̣[υ]τ̣ω̣ν P^{45}

9:40a εξω παντας ς rell : παντας εξω C 69 102 255 1^{53} : παντας 1522 : [?].ρος παντας P^{45}

Acts

(n) 9:40b τα γονατα προσηυξατο ς rell : [τα] γ̣ο̣να̣
προσηυ[ξατο γον]ατα προσηυξατο P^{45}

9:41 τους αγιους και τας χηρας ς rell : τας
χηρας και τους [αγιους] P^{45} : τους
αποστολους και τας χηρας 915

10:10 εγενετο sec P^{74} ℵ A B C 36 81 181 323 440
453 945 1175 1739 2298 pc : η̣λθεν P^{45} eth :
επεπεσεν ς rell : επεσεν 460 919 pc

10:11 και τεσσαρσιν αρχαις δεδεμενον σκευος τι (om
Ψ) ως οθονην μεγαλην (add και 1108) καταβαινον
και καθιεμενον Ψ 5 33 441 1108 1518 1827 (om
και καθ.) 2138 : κα̣ι τεσσαρσιν αρχαις
δεδ[εμενον σκευος τι καθιε]μενον P^{45} : και
καταβαινον (-νοντα 88 181) σκευος τι ως οθονην
μεγαλην (om C^2 915) τεσσαρσιν αρχαις
καθιεμενον (-μενην 88 181 915 1874 1877) P^{74}
ℵ A B C^2 E (τετρασιν) 88 181 431 915 1175 1874
1877 : και καταβαινον σκευος τι ως οθονην
μεγαλην τεσσαρσιν αρχαις δεδεμενον και
καθιεμενον 81 629^c 630 945 (το κατα.) 1739 :
και καταβαινον επ αυτον σκευος τι ως οθονην
μεγαλην (de C* non liquet) τεσσαρσιν αρχαις
δεδεμενον (-μενην 467 1505) και καθιεμενον (cont.)

Acts

10:11 (-μενην 467) ϛ C^{*vid} 326 (επ αυτω et και τεσσαρσιν) rell (69 104 2495 καθημενον, 1838 om και καθ.) : και τεσσαρσιν αρχαις δεδεμενον σκευος τι ως οθονην μεγαλην καταβαινον επ αυτον και καθιεμενον 623 913

10:13 πετρε ϛ rell : om P^{45} it^{gig} Cl Ambr

** 10:20 και πορευου συν αυτοις ϛ rell : συν αυτοις κα[ι πορευου] P^{45} 5 623

** 10:21 ιδου ϛ rell : om P^{45vid} pr sp 1518

10:31 η προσευχη ϛ rell : η ευχ̣η̣ P^{45} : η δεησις 1522 : η δεησια 1829 : αι προσευχαι 1518

10:32 ξενιζεται εν οικια σιμωνος βυρσεως ϛ rell : εν οικια σιμω[νος βυρσεως ξενιζεται] P^{45} : ξενιζεται εν οικια σιμωνος τινος βυρσεως 103 242 630 1522 2298 pc : ξενιζεται παρα τινι σιμωνι βυρσει C 36 94 pc

10:33a παντες ϛ rell : om P^{45}

10:33b ενωπιον του θεου παρεσμεν ϛ P^{74} D^2 rell : παρε[σμεν ενωπιον του θ̅υ̅ (= θεου)] P^{45} : ενωπιον του κυριου παρεσμεν 323 327 441 1518 : ενωπιον σου D* (et add βουλομενοι post ακουσαι) 629

10:38 διηλθεν ϛ rell : περ̣ι̣[ηλθ]ε̣[ν] P^{45} syr^s Ir^{lat}

Acts

10:39a ημεις εσμεν μαρτυρες ς rell : ημεις με[ν μαρτυρες] P^{45vid} : ημεις μαρτυρες ℵ B C E Ψ 36 81 94 181 322 323 623 630 1175 1518^{c} 1739 al : υμεις μαρτυρες A D : ημεις μαρτυρες εσμεν 242 614 1108 1518*

** 10:39b παντων ς pm : om P^{45vid} pr sp 383 915

11:3 οτι ς rell : om P^{45}

11:5 καθιεμενην ς rell : καθ̣ε̣ιμενον P^{45} : καθειμενην 614 2138

11:8 μου ς rell : om P^{45}

11:11 επεστησαν ς rell : [επεστ]ησαν μοι P^{45}

11:26 εν αντιοχεια (-χια ℵ E) τους μαθητας ς rell (D aliter) : τους μαθητας εν αντι̣[οχ]εια P^{45} : εις αντιοχειαν τους μαθητας A : τους μαθητας 1838

11:29a ωρισαν (ωρισεν A 3 209*) εκαστος ς rell : [εκαστ]ος ωρισαν P^{45}

11:29b αυτων ς rell : om P^{45}

11:30 σαυλου ς rell : σα̣[ο]υλ P^{45} : παυλου 1898 2138

12:14 του πετρου ς rell : om P^{45vid} pr sp

12:20 ομοθυμαδον δε ς rell (D οι δε ομοθ. et aliter) : και ο̣μοθυμα[δον] P^{45} : ομοθυμαδον τε Ψ 209^{c} 226^{c} 1611 2138 K^{r} pc

Acts

13:7 σαυλον ς rell : σαουλ P^{45} :
παυλον $\underline{I}^{c1}$: παυλω 326 1837

13:10 ειπεν ante ω ς rell : ειπεν post δολου P^{45}

(D) 13:13a αναχθεντες ς rell : [αν]α̣χθεντε P^{45} :
ανεχθεντες B*

13:13b δε ante απο ς rell : [και] ante αναχθ.
P^{45vid} it vg : om 915 1838

13:14 αυτοι δε ς rell : ουτοι δε P^{45} :
παυλος δε και βαρναβας E

13:25a αξιος post ουκ ειμι sec ς rell : αξιος ante
ουκ ειμι P^{45} : ικανος (pro αξιος) post ουκ
ειμι 36 181 307 337 460

13:25b ειμι ς rell : ειμι εγω P^{45}

13:27 παν σαββατον ς rell : σαββατον [παν] P^{45} :
πασαν σαββατον 440 1838

13:33 τω ψαλμω γεγραπται τω δευτερω P^{74} ℵ A B C Ψ
33 81 181 630 945 1522 (om τω pri) 1739 al :
τω δευτερω ψαλμω γεγραπται H 056 0142 103
440 pc : τω ψαλμω τω δευτερω γεγραπται ς pm
(241 om τω pri) : τω πρωτω ψαλμω γεγραπται
D it$^{d,gig,ph^{mg}}$ Or Hil Ps-Jerome Latin mss$^{acc.\ to\ Bede}$: τω ψαλμω γεγραπται 522 1175 Hil Hes
Beda : τοις ψα̣λ̣μ̣[οις γεγραπται] P^{45} it^{t} Tert^{pt}

(D) 13:46a κρινετε ς rell : κρειντε P^{45} : κρεινατε D*

Acts

** 13:46b εαυτους ς rell : αυτους P^{45} 206*

13:46c αιωνιου ς rell : αιωνιας P^{45} :
ουρανιου 323

** 13:47 ειναι σε ς rell : ε̣ιναι P^{45} 206 242 522

13:48 εχαιρον (vel εχαιρε) και ς rell : om
p^{45vid} pr sp

** 13:49 του κυριου ς pm : om P^{45} 242

13:52 τε A B 33 36 94 104 453 945 1739 al :
γε P^{45} : δε ς P^{74} pm

14:15a και ημεις ς rell : om P^{45} : ημεις D 1175

14:15b απο et επιστρεφειν ς rell : αποστηναι απο
et [κ]αι επιστρεφειν P^{45} : οπως (E ινα) απο
et επιστρεψηται (= -τε, E -εφητε) D E

14:16 γενεαις ς rell : om P^{45}

** 14:19a επηλθον (-θαν ℵ A B 81) ς rell :
απηλθον P^{45} 337 460 1319

14:19b και ικονιου ιουδαιοι ς rell (D pc aliter) :
ιουδαιοι και ι̣[κονιου] P^{45}

(n) 14:19c λιθασαντες ς rell : λι̣σ̣αντες P^{45} :
λιθοβολησαντες A 36 94 pc

(n) 15:7 ζητησεως (vel συζητησεως [συνζ- C D E]) ς
rell : ζητ̣[ησεως ουκ ολι]γ̣ης τωι παυλωι και̣
τωι βαρναβα [πρ]ος αυ[τους εταξαν αναβα]ι̣νευν
παυλον και β̣α̣ρ̣ν̣α̣βαν κα[ι τ]ινας (φomt.)

Acts

15:7 [αλλους εξ αυτων πρ]ο̣[ς το]υ̣ς̣ [απ]οστολους
κ̣α̣ι̣ [π]ρ[εσβυ]τ̣ερ[ου]ς P^{45}

15:20 και της πορνειας (-νιας ℵ E al) ς rell :
om P^{45} arm eth^{ro} Or (?)

15:21a κατα πολιν ς rell : om P^{45}

(n) 15:21b εχει ς rell : εκει P^{45}

15:23a οι sec ς rell : om P^{45}

15:23b συριαν ς rell (C* συρια) : την συριαν P^{45}

15:38 τουτον ς rell : om P^{45} it^{gig} vg^{cl} :
αυτον 1311

(o) 15:41a διηρχετο ς rell : [διηρ]κετο P^{45}

15:41b την συριαν και (add την B D Ψ 36 453 pc)
κιλικιαν (E κιλιαν) ς rell : δια της
συριας και της κιλικιας P^{45}

16:1 ονοματι ς rell : om P^{45}

** 16:3a λαβων ς rell : ελαβεν και P^{45} 614 1611 pc

(n) 16:3b περιτεμεν ς rell : περιτεμων P^{45}

16:17 δουλοι ς rell : om P^{45}

16:18a και pri ς rell (D aliter) : om P^{45}

16:18b αυτη τη ωρα ς rell : αυτης τη[ς ωρας] P^{45} :
ευθεως D eth^{ro}

** 16:33a αυτος ς rell : και αυτος P^{45} 440

16:33b—

Acts

16:33b οι αυτου παντες (απαντες ℵ B 614 1891 2495 pc)
ς P^{74} rell : ο οικος αυτου ολος P^{45} vg^{cl}
$cop^{bo^{ms}}$: οι οικιοι (= οικειοι) αυτου παντες
A : οι (om 69) υιοι αυτου παντες 69 1^{53} :
οι αυτου 1845 : οι μετ αυτου παντες
$Thphyl^{b}$: οι συν αυτω παντες 1874 : παντες
οι αυτου 2180 : ο οικος αυτου απαντες 181
1898

(n) 16:35 ραβδουχους ς rell : αβδουχους P^{45}

16:37 ανθρωπους ρωμαιους υπαρχοντας ς rell :
υπαρχοντας ρωμαιους ανθ̣ρωπους P^{45}

16:38a τοις στρατηγοις οι ραβδουχοι τα ρηματα ταυτα
ς rell (D* αυτοισοι pro τοις) : [τα ρηματα]
ταυτα post τοις στρα̣[τηγοις] P^{45} : οι
ραβδουχοι ante τοις στρατηγοις E pc :
om τοις στρατηγοις 383

(n) 16:38b οι ραβδουχοι ς rell : τοις ραβδουχ̣ο̣ι[ς] P^{45}

17:10 απησαν ς rell (απιεσαν 0120, εισηεδαν E) :
om P^{45} (et fortasse π̣[αρεγενοντο] pro
παραγενομενοι)

** 17:11 εχοι ταυτα ουτως ς pm : ταυτα ουτως εχοι
P^{45} 69 (ταυθ) 181 547 1175 1898 it vg

Acts

** 17:12a εξ (D om) αυτων επιστευσαν ς rell :
επιστε[υσαν εξ αυτων] P^{45} 919 1898 it vg

17:12b των sec ς rell (D aliter) : και των P^{45}

(o) 17:12c ουκ ς rell : ουχ P^{45}

(o) 17:13 ηλθον ς rell : ηλθαν P^{45}

17:16 δε ς rell : om P^{45}

The total number of singular readings in P^{45} is 240, of which 8 are orthographic singulars and 10 are nonsense singulars. There remain thus 222 significant singulars.[18]

Orthography.--After the removal of any variations caused by interchange of ει/ι, αι/ε, and οι/υ,[19] only 8 readings (3.3% of the singulars) appear to be orthographic in origin. Two of these involve aspiration: at Mk 7:33a P^{45} reads καθ ιδιαν, and at Ac 17:12c ουχ ολιγοι. The aspirated forms ἵδιος and ὁλίγος are attested in other New Testament manuscripts and in other Hellenistic texts.[20] (Note also that P^{45} is supported by W alone in having καθ ιδιαν at Mk 9:2a.)

There are also 3 cases of confusion of similar sounds. At Lk 11:7a P^{45} reads δωναι for δουναι;[21] and at Ac 15:21b and 15:41a it reads κ for χ.[22] There is one case of omission of final -ς, Ac 13:13a,[23] and one case of addition of final -ς, Ac 4:32.[24] And there is one case of loss of ε, Ac 13:46a.[25]

Nonsense Readings.--In his "Scribal Habits" Colwell called attention to the comparatively small number of nonsense readings found among the singulars of P^{45}: "when the scribe of P^{45} creates a singular reading, it almost always makes sense."[26] And Colwell concludes that "P^{45} must be

UMI

given credit for a much greater density of intentional changes than the other two [P^{66} and P^{75}]."[27]

Examining our list of singulars we find, in fact, that P^{45} has only 2 strictly nonsense readings: Ac 14:19c (omission of a syllable),[28] and Ac 16:35 (omission of a letter). We may note immediately that both of these occur within Acts, even though only 36.3% of the singulars fall within Acts; this fact suggests that the scribe's attention faltered as he approached the end of his task.[29] These strictly nonsense readings are .8% of the singulars.

When we turn to those readings which are nonsense in context, we find 8 additional readings:[30] Lk 10:30, 10:34b, 11:20, 12:52a; Ac 7:12, 9:40b, 15:7, and 16:38b. Again the frequency of error increases toward the end, since 50% of these occur within Acts. Influence of nearby words seems to have operated in 3 of these cases (Lk 10:34b,[31] 11:20; Ac 16:38b), and in one case "words with similar beginnings are confused"[32]: Lk 10:30--although the subsequent mention of ιερευς τις may have aided the confusion. And in one case the scribe appears to have misunderstood the abbreviation of a nomen sacrum: Ac 7:12.[33]

In one case the scribe extended his fondness for singular verbs with neuter plural subjects--to be discussed below--to a (presumably) masculine plural subject: Lk 12:52a.

And in the remaining 2 cases we have dittographies caused by a backwards scribal leap.[34] At Ac 9:40b (a leap to the similar) the scribe apparently went back to τα after writing the -το of προσηυξατο. And at Ac 15:7 the scribe seems to have lost his place at ζητησεως, and returned to the occurrence of this word at 15:2.[35]

Thus, the nonsense in context readings amount to 3.3% of the singular readings of P^{45}, and the total of 10 nonsense readings is 4.2% of the singular readings. Colwell's judgment that the scribe thus copies carefully is confirmed, although the pattern of nonsense readings (and of orthographic singulars) makes evident that this care lessened somewhat in the book of Acts.

Corrections.--There are 11 corrections in P^{45}, listed in Appendix A. Two of these are, it seems, by a second hand: Mt 25:42[36] and Ac 7:12.[37] Of the 11 readings of P^{45*} only 1 is strictly nonsense: Ac 5:38. Two others (Ac 7:14, 13:12) are orthographic corrections, and 2 more could be viewed as orthographic (if not nonsense in context): Lk 9:36; Ac 16:17. Two more are nonsense in context: Lk 9:58; Ac 7:12. In the remaining 4 cases the readings of both P^{45*} and P^{45c} are sensical. In the case of the original omission at Mt 25:42, (as in B*), the scribe clearly went back to vs. 35, and thus wrote something which would have been perplexing in the context of vs. 42.[38] P^{45*}'s ηρωδης in Mk 6:22 is doubtless caused by the context: Herod's name occurs 7 times from βασιλευς in vs. 14 to the next βασιλευς in vs. 22.[39] At Jn 10:14 the original scribe changes to the "correct" singular verb with neuter plural subject--the only case of a correction to a singular reading. And at Jn 11:47 the scribe was tempted to change what appears to be a very rare use of the deliberative present.[40]

The rather small number of corrections and small number of nonsense readings confirm Colwell's characterization of the scribe of P^{45}:

> This scribe does not actually copy words. He sees through the language to its idea-content, and copies that--often in words of his own choosing, or in words rearranged as to order.[41]

What the scribe produces as his own readings almost always make sense. In fact, we have isolated 240 such creations, and 226 (94.2%) of them read (more or less) smoothly. Lack of systematic correction of these singulars by the scribe or anyone else shows that the scribe himself caused this smoothness.

Colwell rightly contrasts P^{45}'s copying by "idea-content" with other scribes' copying by letters or syllables. We may see that P^{45} has on occasion confused a letter or two, but in fact the scribe rarely confuses *merely* a letter, for such confusion would in at least most cases result in strictly nonsense readings. However, as we have seen, in only 3 cases (1.3% of the singulars) did P^{45} produce strictly nonsense readings by making an error with just 1 letter. Clearly, therefore, the scribe did not in general proceed letter by letter.

It is equally clear that the scribe did not copy generally by syllables. Indeed, Colwell claims:

> In P^{45} there is not one omission of a syllable in a "leap" [from the same to the same] nor is there any occurrence of "careless" omissions of syllables.[42]

However, the evidence shows that there is indeed 1 careless omission of a syllable: Ac 14:19c, where θα is omitted from the middle of λιθασαντες. Thus, only .4% of the singulars are strictly nonsense readings resulting from an error with just 1 syllable.

We turn next to those larger carriers of idea-content, words and phrases, which were created by the scribe of P^{45}.

Additions.--There are 28 significant singulars (12.6% of the significant singulars) which involve an addition. All but 4 of these are of 1 word only. However, there are also the 2 dittographies (Ac 9:40b and 15:7) which give nonsense in context, and thus are not included here.

One addition comes from a Synoptic parallel: Lk 12:24a from Mt 6:26 (note that D it$^{d,e,(f),l,r^1}$ replace the Lukan phrase with the Matthaean one, while P^{45} conflates the two). But 11 additions appear to arise through the influence of the immediate context: Mt 25:43b (ημην...ημην), Mk 7:5 (ανιπτοις from 7:2), Mk 7:28 (τα ...τα), Lk 12:55 (ιδητε [vs. 54]...ιδητε), Lk 13:32b (και...και), Lk 14:5a (η...η), Jn 11:43 (ελθε εξω και εξηλθεν), Ac 9:39c (emphasizing, on the basis of vs. 36, that Dorcas had made these things for the widows), Ac 13:25b (ειμι εγω...ειμι εγω), Ac 15:23b (την...την), and Ac 17:12b (και των...και των). These and other cases of harmonization to the immediate context will be discussed further below.

In 3 cases among these 28 a pronoun is added: Ac 9:39c, 11:11, 13:25b. In 6 cases the addition is an article: Mk 7:28; Lk 10:19, 12:58a, 14:23a; Jn 10:36; Ac 15:23b. (The addition of the article at Lk 14:23a, indeed, serves the purpose of removing what might have been felt as the ungrammatical τας οδους και φραγμους.[43]) And in 10 cases a conjunction is added: και 4 times (Lk 10:37, 13:32b; Jn 10:15; Ac 17:12b), δε twice (Jn 10:22, 10:39), ουν twice (Mk 12:14; Lk 12:28b), η once (Lk 14:5a), and εαν once (Lk 12:3).

At Jn 11:2a the addition of αυτη η serves to emphasize the identification with the Mary of ch. 12.[44] And in 2 other cases the scribe has shown an interest in clarification: In Mk 6:21 the temporal dative receives an εν,[45] and in Ac 14:15b the construction is made more straightforward by the addition of αποστηναι (and then also και).[46] The 1 remaining addition, Mt 26:6b, is curious; presumably there is some attempt at clarification here, also.

One of the 28 additions (Lk 12:24a) is of 5 words, 3 (Mk 7:5; Jn 11:2a; Ac 14:15b) are of 2 words, and the other 24 are of 1 word only. Thus, a total of 35 words are added by means of these 28 scribal creations, an average of 1.3 words per addition.

Omissions.--There are 63 significant singulars (28.4% of the significant singulars) which are omissions. Of evident importance is the fact that P^{45} omits more than twice as often as he adds.[47] Even more striking is that numerous rather lengthy omissions occur. One (Lk 10:27) is of 17 words,[48] 1 (Mk 11:27) is of 10 words, 1 (Jn 10:35) is of 7 words, and 4 (Mk 6:40; Lk 12:2; Ac 5:13, 10:11[49]) are of 5 words. We find, moreover, 1 singular (Mk 12:26) omitting 4 words, 7 singulars (Mk 5:21, 6:49; Lk 10:21, 12:47; Jn 11:25a, 11:51; Ac 15:20) omitting 3 words, and 10 singulars (Mk 9:28b; Lk 10:11a, 11:14, 11:19a, 13:12, 14:8b; Jn 11:7; Ac 12:14, 13:48, 15:21a) omitting 2 words. The remaining 38 omissions are of 1 word only. Thus, a total of 137 words are omitted in these singulars, an average of 2.2 words per omission.

We see, accordingly, that our scribe not only omits more than twice as often as he adds, but he omits, on the average, a longer block of text at a time than he adds. If we look at only these two classes of singulars, we find that our scribe's errors resulted in a net loss of 102 words from his Vorlage.[50]

Colwell has commented on P^{45}'s omissions as follows:

> As an editor the scribe of P^{45} wielded a sharp axe. The most striking aspect of his style is its conciseness. The dispensable word is dispensed with. He omits adverbs, adjectives, nouns, participles, verbs, personal pronouns--without any compensating habit of addition. He frequently omits phrases and clauses. He prefers the simple to the compound word. In short, he favors brevity. He shortens the text in at least fifty places in singular readings alone. But he does not drop syllables or letters. His shortened text is readable.[51]

Colwell adds: "Many of his omissions are striking--not to say startling."[52] Among these are the omissions of the details of the feeding of the five thousand at Mk 6:40, 6:41a, and 6:41b, of the prohibition of unchastity at Ac 15:20, and of the reference to life at Jn 11:25a.

Is there any further explanation of such terseness other than that our scribe "favors brevity"? In at least 12 cases the leap from the same to the same may have been the cause of omission. Ten of these are possible homoeoteleuta:[53]

Mk 5:21	παλιν ... περαν
Mk 11:27	ερχονται ... ερχονται
Mk 12:26	και ο θ̅ς̅ ... και ο θ̅ς̅
Lk 9:52	προσωπου αυτου
Lk 10:27	τον θ̅ν̅ σου ... ισχυι σου[54]
Lk 12:2	αποκαλυφθησεται ... γνωσθησεται
Ac 7:41	ημεραις εκειναις
Ac 14:16	παρωχημεναις γενεαις
Ac 15:20	και της πορνειας και[55]
Ac 16:17	ανθρωποι δουλοι

And there are also 2 possible homoeoarcta:

Mk 6:40	κατα εκατον ... και λαβων
Ac 13:48	εχαιρον και εδοξαζον

The first and last cases, though, are rather strained, and indeed we find that P^{45} regularly omits from no discernible cause and with no discernible purpose.

Turning from what are often rather long omissions to the 38 omissions of 1 word only, we find that such omissions may be classified as follows:

a) Pronouns (11 cases): Mt 26:21a; Lk 9:36b, 9:49, 9:52, 10:11c, 12:36b; Ac 7:41, 11:8, 11:29b, 14:15a, 15:38.

b) Conjunctions (10 cases): και twice (Lk 9:58; Ac 16:18a), δε twice (Lk 10:31; Ac 17:16), γαρ twice (Lk 12:52b; Ac 5:36), οτι twice (Lk 11:42b; Ac 11:3), ινα once (Mt 26:5), and ουν once (Jn 11:45).

c) Articles (4 cases): Lk 9:33, 11:11b, 11:42a; Ac 15:23a.

d) Nouns (4 cases): Lk 11:29; Ac 14:16, 16:1, 16:17.

e) Numerals (2 cases): Mk 6:41a, 6:41b.

f) Adjectives (2 cases): Lk 12:27; Ac 10:33a.

g) Verbs (2 cases): Lk 13:30; Ac 17:10.

h) Proper name (1 case): Ac 10:13.[56]

i) Adverb (1 case): Ac 7:34.

j) Preposition (1 case): Lk 11:32.

Some of these omissions might be thought to be consequences of certain grammatical tendencies. The dropping of superfluous pronouns, for example, could be part of an attempt to return to the standards of Attic

Greek.[57] On the other hand, omission of a conjunction usually produces asyndeton, and it is difficult to see how that could be a conscious goal of the scribe, especially when we note that he sometimes adds conjunctions in order (it appears) to avoid asyndeton. Some of these issues will be discussed further in the section on grammatical changes below, but the general impression given by these numerous omissions is to confirm Colwell's judgment that the scribe regularly dispenses with unnecessary words.

The 4 cases of omissions of nouns, by the way, provide yet another indication that the scribe of P^{45} was concerned to give a readable text, in spite of such pruning. Random dropping of conjunctions, of course, will produce nothing worse than asyndeton, but random dropping of nouns is likely to produce nonsense. It is significant, therefore, that only 4 nouns are omitted, and 2 of these (Ac 14:16, 16:17) probably by homoeoteleuton. Moreover, only 1 of these omissions has serious consequences for the sense. Indeed, one might think that ταις παρωχημεναις used substantively in Ac 14:16 really is nonsense in context.[58] I suppose, though, that a charitable reader could supply, say, ημεραις,[59] and thus that even in those cases where P^{45} drops an apparently crucial word, he does it in such a way that the sense is not totally destroyed.

Finally, the influence of the context may have operated in a few cases of omission. At Mt 26:5 ινα could have been dropped because of the μη standing alone in the previous clause.[60] And the omission of και η ζωη at Jn 11:25a probably occurred because the resurrection alone is mentioned in vs. 24.[61]

Transpositions.--We turn next to another pervasive feature of our scribe's copying: the creation of transpositions. Forty-seven significant singulars (21.2% of the significant singulars) arise because of differences in word order. Colwell analyzes one cause of such errors as follows:

> By a leap [from the same to the same] the scribe jumps over a word, copies the following word, looks back at his exemplar, catches his error, and writes in the omitted word out of order.[62]

Five such cases (including leaps over more than 1 word) are cited by Colwell: Lk 10:38, 12:11, 12:36a; Ac 10:32, and 16:37, although Ac 10:32 is not in fact of this type. However, there are actually 13 more or less likely cases of a transposition resulting from an omission by homoeoteleuton followed by a "correction":

Mk 6:48a	τεταρτην φυλακην της νυκτος[63]
Mk 9:7	ουτος ... ο υιος μου
Lk 10:38	αυτους αυτος εισηλθεν
Lk 11:7b	δυναμαι ... δουναι σοι
Lk 12:7a	τριχες ... κεφαλης υμων
Lk 12:11	τας συναγωγας και τας αρχας
Lk 12:36a	ελθοντος και κρουσαντος ευθεως[64]
Lk 12:48	πολυ πολυ ζητηθησεται
Lk 13:10	διδασκων ... συναγωγων τοις σαββασιν
Jn 10:18b	ταυτην την εντολην ελαβον[65]
Jn 11:31	οτι υπαγει εις το μνημειον
Ac 9:41	τους ... τας χηρας
Ac 16:37	κριτους ανθρωπους ρωμαιους υπαρχοντας

As with omissions, though, we do not need to postulate homoeoteleuton (in some of the above cases rather improbable) as a cause of transposition. For there are the following 34 cases which cannot be so explained:[66] Mt 26:1, 26:12; Mk 6:17, 6:19, 6:37, 7:33c, 7:35, 8:20, 9:3; Lk 9:53a, 10:16, 10:40a, 10:41, 11:44, 12:28a,[67] 12:52c, 13:15b, 13:24, 14:5b; Jn 10:18a, 10:34-35, 11:9; Ac 4:30, 5:34, 5:38, 10:32, 10:33b, 11:26, 11:29a, 13:10, 13:25a, 13:27, 14:19b, 16:38a.

Moreover, the scribe of P^{45} also transposes comparatively long blocks of words. Colwell claims that of the 37 transpositions due simply to "carelessness as to word order,"[68] 20 involve more than 3 words.[69] Our count of the words involved in our 47 cases gives the following results:

2 words: 12 cases
3 words: 12 cases
4 words: 11 cases[70]
5 words: 7 cases
6 words: 2 cases (Mt 26:1, Lk 13:10)
7 words: 1 case (Lk 10:40a)
10 words: 1 case (Mt 26:12)
25 words: 1 case (Jn 10:34-35)

Thus, 23 transpositions involve more than 3 words, and 12 involve more than 4 words.

Two of the longest cases are mentioned specifically by Colwell:

> In two passages he [the scribe of P^{45}] transposes a word or phrase an incredible distance, perhaps for better style: in Luke 10:40 the pronoun μου is advanced, and in John 10 the words "in the scripture" are moved ahead from vs. 35 to 34.[71]

Such a pattern of lengthy transpositions confirms Colwell's view that the scribe looks to ideas. Whatever the cause of the transposition and however long the text involved, the scribe ends up with understandable Greek.

Actually, I believe that the omissions and transpositions in P^{45} might be more reasonably classified as uncorrected omissions and corrected omissions, following

Colwell's analysis quoted earlier. Thus, of the 222 significant singulars in P^{45} fully 110 (49.5%) have arisen through an omission, sometimes (in perhaps 25 cases) because of a leap to the same or similar letter or block of letters. What has then happened is that the scribe just failed to notice, failed to care about, or even deliberately created 63 of these omissions, and so in these 63 cases we are left with an omission in the text.

But in 47 cases the scribe caught his error, and corrected himself. However, the scribe of P^{45} did not make his corrections by erasures, dots, or other marks.[72] For the scribe is clearly not particularly concerned with whether or not the order of words is reproduced exactly. The most that he cares about is to reproduce the thought through some word order or another.[73] Consequently, P^{45} "corrects" simply by writing the omitted words at the first place which will give a readable text. And thus arise at least most of the transpositions.

Naturally, there are a few readings for which this way of looking at transpositions is problematic. The reading at Jn 10:34-35 is probably a deliberate alteration for a reason that is not clear to us. And in 3 other cases the change in word order may have arisen because of the influence of the immediate context: Mk 8:20 (κλασματων πληρωματα parallels κλασματων πληρεις in vs. 19), Lk 10:16 (υμας αθετων parallels εμε αθετει and εμε αθετων), and Jn 10:18a (with παλιν moved, εξουσιαν εχω θειναι αυτην parallels εξουσιαν εχω λαβειν αυτην).

However, looking at transpositions as omissions which our scribe has corrected in his own way accounts for the vast majority of the cases, and enables us to view both the numerous omissions and the numerous transpositions in the text as two sorts of results of the manner in which the scribe of P^{45} proceeded in his task of copying.

Of course, it should be emphasized that P^{45}'s freedom from the requirement of exact reproduction is only relative; after all, his is still copying, and not authoring his own work. Most of the words in his Vorlage were doubtless copied correctly, and even in their given order. But in contrast to what might be thought the ideal, the scribe of P^{45} deals with the text freely.

We turn next to examples of harmonization, some of which we have already met.

Harmonization to Parallels.--The following 11 readings of P^{45} probably have their origin in parallel texts:

Mt 20:31a: The influence is from Mk 10:48 = Lk 18:39: πολλω μαλλον.[74] (א takes over both words, P^{45} πολλω only.)

Mk 8:10: The reading of P^{45} is fragmentary, but, as is the case with D Θ f^1 f^{13} 28 565, P^{45} probably adopted a reading from Mt 15:39, either μαγεδαν of $\aleph^c$ (which has widespread versional support at Mk 8:10) or μαγαδαν of ℵ* B D 1365 or μαγδαλαν of C N W 33 565 al.

Mk 8:12a: The αιτει here appears to come from 1 Cor 1:22: σημεια (σημειον ς pm) αιτουσιν. At Mt 16:4 B* also reads σημειον αιτει. The order with σημειον before the verb, which has influenced P^{45} and the majority reading here, is found in Mt 12:39, 16:4, and Lk 11:29, as well as 1 Cor 1:22.

Lk 9:30: The participle comes from Mt 17:3 and Mk 9:4,[75] where several manuscripts also have συνλ-. Since P^{45} fails to take over the finite verb from the parallels, it has here ιδου plus participle alone, a construction attested elsewhere in the NT.[76]

Lk 10:11a: The parallel at Mt 10:14 also omits τον κολληθεντα, as does the similar passage at Lk 9:5.

Lk 11:12: The parallel at Mt 7:9 has provided αρτον to replace the NT hapax legomenon ωον. P^{45} has not, though, replaced Lk's σκορπιον by Mt's λιθον.

Lk 12:7b: P^{45} has probably adopted ηριθμημεναι from Mt 10:30. D Θ al take over the entire phrase ηριθμημεναι εισιν from Mt 10:30, and it is possible that P^{45}'s reading comes from that of D Θ al by dropping

UMI

ειϲιν. But I believe that it is more likely that here, as at Mt 20:31a and Lk 9:30, P^{45} chooses only a portion of the parallel text; D Θ al could easily have harmonized independently.

Lk 12:24a: Here P^{45} conflates the parallel Mt 6:26 with Lk 12:24; D adopts the reading of Mt alone.

Lk 12:24b: The plural form αποθηκαι reflects Mt 6:26: συναγουσιν εις αποθηκας.[77]

Lk 12:51: The use of επι probably comes from Mt 10:34's επι την γην, although P^{45} (unlike 157 1093 1424) uses the genitive case here.

Lk 13:30: The omission of ειϲιν agrees with Mt 19:30 and Mk 10:31.

Although our evidence is limited by the fact that so little of Mt is extant in P^{45}, and so much of P^{45} is taken up with Acts, harmonization appears fairly frequent, occurring primarily (it seems) in Lk from Mt.[78]

Harmonization to Context.--More frequent than harmonization to parallels is harmonization with nearby words. As Colwell says:

> The influence of a neighboring word, of a balancing clause in the same sentence, of the familiar phraseology of the Gospel in question, was evidently inescapable. Harmonization to immediate context is usually mentioned incidentally in our manuals. It needs to be given headlines on the front page.[79]

This opinion is supported by the fact that P^{45} has a total of 38 significant singulars caused--as it seems--by the influence of the context.[80] The results of such influence may be omissions, additions, transpositions, substitutions, or grammatical shifts, but they all arise from the conscious or unconscious assimilation of originally differing texts.

The following categories indicate the range of ways in which such influence may operate.

a) Addition (11 cases): These are listed in the previous discussion of additions.[81]

b) Substitution (11 cases):[82] Mt 25:44 (ασθενης *και* εν φυλακη in vs. 43), Mk 6:48b (ερχεται and παρελθειν in vs. 48), Mk 7:8 (εντολην in vs. 8a), Lk 10:8 (εις ην δ αν in vss. 5 and 10), Lk 11:8 (αναστας in vs. 8a),[83] Lk 11:11a (γαρ in vs. 10), Jn 11:44 (δεδεμενος in vs. 44a), Ac 9:18a (και *ter* in vs. 18), Ac 9:19b (ικανας in vss. 23, 43),[84] Ac 12:20 (και in vs. 20b), Ac 16:33b (συ και ο οικος σου in vs. 32 [cf. Ac 11:14, 18:8]).

c) Transposition (3 cases): These are listed in the previous discussion of transpositions.[85]

d) Omission (2 cases): These are listed in the previous discussion of omissions.[86]

e) Grammatical attraction (11 cases):[87]

Mt 26:6a: dative attracted to προσηλθεν αυτω

Mk 9:28a: dative attracted to προσηλθον...αυτω (cf. Mk 9:28c)

Lk 6:37: future passive attracted to απολυθησεσθε

Lk 9:31: εμελλον attracted to ελεγον

Lk 9:53b: πορευομενου attracted to αυτου

Lk 10:34a: επιχεας attracted to aorists προσελθων, κατεδησεν, επιβιβασας

Lk 14:20: ηγαμησα attracted to ηγορασα bis in vss. 18-19[88]

Ac 4:31: του $\overline{\pi\nu\varsigma}$ του αγιου attracted to του ονοματος του αγιου (παιδος) in vs. 30

Ac 9:39b: aorist attracted to παρεστησεν

Ac 11:5: καθειμενον attracted to καταβαινον

Ac 15:41b: δια της... attracted to διηρχετο

Harmonization to General Usage.--Colwell mentions briefly this third kind of harmonization.[89] Perhaps 3 cases occur in P^{45}:[90]

Lk 11:43: The singular of αγορα occurs five times in the NT, and indeed in the last occurrence of the word which our scribe had seen in his copying: Mt 20:3; Mk 7:4; Lk 7:32; Ac 16:19, 17:17. (But the plural does occur four times: Mt 11:16, 23:7; Mk 6:56, 12:38.[91])

Jn 10:36: The addition of the article here gives the formula: ο υιος του θεου.

Jn 11:57: The substitution here gives the formula "chief priests and elders," which occurs at Mt 21:23, 26:3, 26:47, 26:59 (c̲ pm), 27:1, 27:3, 27:12, 27:20; Ac 4:23, 23:14, 25:15.[92]

We have thus found a total of 52 readings among P^{45}'s significant singulars which have resulted (it appears) from harmonization. The percentages of the significant singulars and of the harmonizations which each type of harmonization has are as follows:

	222 sign. singulars	52 harmonizations
38 to context	17.1%	73.1%
11 to parallels	5.0%	21.2%
3 to usage	1.4%	5.8%
52 harmonizations	23.4%	

Clearly, at least as far as P^{45} is concerned, Colwell is completely correct in his comment:

> Harmonization of all kinds occurs; but the dominant type to which the textual critic needs to be especially alert is harmonization to immediate context.[93]

Also important is the pattern of results created by harmonization. The following is a measure of how many errors of three major sorts are due to harmonizing:

Category	Context	Par.	Usage	Total Harm.	% of Cat.
28 additions	11	1	1	13	46.4%
63 omissions	2	2	0	4	6.3%
47 transpositions	3	0	0	3	6.4%

We see, then, that of these three categories of scribal creations only the additions arise to a considerable extent (indeed, almost half) from harmonization. It is evident that harmonization of any sort plays only a minor role in the creation of omissions and transpositions. Indeed, that few omissions would be caused by harmonization is readily understandable. Noting that a certain word or phrase does not occur in a parallel or even in the immediate context involves a more conscious activity (perhaps even deliberate editing) than does the repetition of a nearby word or of a word or phrase from a familiar parallel passage.[94]

Actually, most of the harmonizations in P^{45} involve replacement of one word or phrase by another. Combining categories b) and e) of the harmonizations to context, we find the following pattern, where the percentages indicate what amount of the sort of harmonization noted is of the error in question:

	Replacement	Addition	Omission	Transp.
38 to context	22(57.9%)	11(28.9%)	2(5.3%)	3(7.9%)
11 to parallels	8(72.7%)	1(9.1%)	2(18.2%)	0
3 to usage	2(66.7%)	1(33.3%)	0	0
52 harmonizations	32(61.5%)	13(25.0%)	4(7.7%)	3(5.8%)

The precise figures here are not, of course, of crucial significance. But the general tendency of P^{45}'s harmonizing is clear. In almost one-fourth (23.4%) of his significant singulars, harmonization is involved. The immediate context has by far the greatest influence, parallels less impact, and general usage is a distant third. The effect of harmonization is, in a majority of cases to create a replacement, less often (but still in one-fourth of the instances) to add something to a text, and rather infrequently to omit or to transpose.

It should be recalled here that, as noted above, our picture is doubtless skewed by what survives of P^{45}. Harmonization to parallels would have fewer chances of applying in Acts, which makes up almost half of what we have of P^{45}. Indeed, all 11 cases of harmonization to parallels are, as we might expect, from the Synoptic Gospels. Nevertheless, even in the Synoptics we find that harmonization is twice as often to the context as to a parallel, as the following two tables show:

Harmonization in the Synoptics

Context	22 (64.7%)
Parallels	11 (32.4%)
Usage	1 (2.9%)
Total	34

Harmonization in John and Acts

Context	16 (88.9%)
Parallels	0
Usage	2 (11.1%)
Total	18

It is plausible enough that harmonization to parallels should play a much greater role in the Synoptic Gospels than elsewhere, but perhaps surprising that even there the context has significantly more influence.

Finally, it is interesting to note that only 2 cases of conflation are found among our singulars: Lk 12:24a and Mk 7:5.

Grammatical Changes.--Included under this heading are the numerous singulars which involve, or may perhaps involve, considerations of grammar, style, Atticism, Semitic influence, and the like.[95] We have already met some of these readings, and it is indeed often difficult to decide what may lie behind such changes. But the following classification appears to cover at least most of the relevant cases.

Five readings arise from the interchange of grammatical forms. At Lk 9:32 the scribe has added an augment to a participle.[96] At Lk 12:8b we find εαυτον for αυτον, an example of a variation which occurs frequently in the manuscripts.[97] P^{45} writes μηδε εν for μηδεν at Ac 8:24, another common fluctuation.[98] At Ac 9:19a a σ is inserted to give ενισχυσθη.[99] And at Ac 17:13 we find ηλθαν for ηλθον, one of many examples of the intrusion of the first aorist -αν into the second aorist paradigm.[100]

Verbs.--In three cases P^{45} replaces a finite verb by a participle: Lk 9:30, 12:7b; Ac 16:3b.[101] The first two cases have already been characterized as harmonizations to the Synoptic parallels. The third case is curious since P^{45} appears to begin (at Ac 16:3a) to replace hypotaxis by parataxis.[102] But then there is the shift to the participle, thus making (it seems) the preceding και intensive.[103]

There are the following changes of tense:

Present to aorist: Lk 10:34a (harmonization to context).

Present to perfect: Ac 11:5.[104]

Imperfect to aorist: Mt 20:31b; Ac 9:39b (harmonization to context).

Aorist to future: Lk 6:37 (harmonization to context).[105]

At Lk 14:8a there is a shift from the aorist passive subjunctive to the present passive imperative. At Lk 9:57 there is a shift from the indicative to the subjunctive.[106] And there is one example of a shift to an imperatival infinitive:[107] Lk 12:5.

One reading involves the replacement of a Hellenistic form by the Attic form: ζησει for ζησεται in Jn 11:25b.[108] And, if our earlier analysis is correct, at Lk 14:20 there is the reverse error from the Attic εγημα to the (incorrectly augmented) Hellenistic form.[109]

Our scribe evidently had a fondness for following the rule, "most strictly followed in Attic,"[110] that a neuter plural subject takes a singular verb. Two of P^{45}'s singulars appear to reflect this fondness: Lk 12:52a and Jn 10:14. Indeed, in the first case, where πεντε is the subject, the scribe seems to have hypercorrected to a nonsense in context reading, since "persons" is presumably understood. John 10 poses some interesting problems. The other manuscripts vary at vss. 8, 12, 16, 27, and 28, for the verb with προβατα.[111] P^{45} is extant at vss. 8, 12, 14, and 16, and reads the plural only at vs. 16,[112] happening to be alone with the singular at vs. 14.[113]

Incidentally, Birdsall[114] calls attention to two other instances of this "correction on stylistic grounds," where P^{45} goes with ς against the Alexandrian manuscripts:

Lk 12:6 πεντε στρουθια πωλουνται: πωλειται P^{45} ς pm
Lk 12:30 παντα τα εθνη...επιζητουσιν: επιζητει P^{45} ς pm.

Finally, in our discussion of verbs should be mentioned P^{45}'s omission of a verb at Lk 13:30 and Ac 17:10, the former of which is a harmonization to the parallels.[115] On the other hand, a verb is added at Mt 25:43b, Lk 12:55, and Jn 11:43 under the influence of the context, while at

Ac 14:15b and perhaps also at Mt 26:6b a verb is added for the sake of clarity. Forms of ποιεω replace less bland verbs at Lk 13:32a and Lk 14:23b, 157 supporting P^{45} at the latter reading.[116]

Conjunctions.--Most of these cases have been examined before. Ten conjunctions are omitted, creating asyndeton in all cases but Ac 11:3 (where οτι introduces a quotation). And in 10 cases conjunctions are added. Three of these create a balance of terms (Lk 13:32b, 14:5a; Ac 17:12b). One case (Lk 10:37) has the effect of changing the preceding και into an intensive particle. The addition of εαν at Lk 12:3 should just be understood as the addition of αν, the two particles often being confused.[117] And the additions of ουν at Mk 12:14 and Lk 12:28b seem to make the connection of ideas smoother.

The three remaining cases occur in Jn 10:15, 22, and 39. In the first case the understanding of the relation between vss. 14 and 15 involves the status of καθως and the subsequent καγω. The two possibilities are well illustrated in the translations of the Authorized Version and the Revised Standard Version:

> AV: I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the father knoweth me, even so know I the Father:....

> RSV: I am the good shepherd; I know my own and my
> own know me, as the Father knows me and I
> know the Father;....

In the AV there is asyndeton between vss. 14 and 15, while in the RSV καθως is taken as connecting the two clauses.

It appears, then, that P^{45} should be understood to have interpreted καθως here as did the AV translators, and thus inserted και in order to relieve the asyndeton.[118]

The two readings at Jn 10:22 and 39 also appear to be cases of the avoidance of asyndeton. But there is a difficulty in deciding which variant should be taken as the Vorlage of P^{45} at these two places. It is, for example, quite conceivable that P^{45} replaced the conjunction in ς pm by δε, rather than introduced δε where no conjunction was present. I believe, though, that the textual support for the readings with asyndeton fits well with what we know of the textual connections of P^{45}: ℵ B D W Θ 1 33 565 at vs. 22 and B Θ 28 565 700 at vs. 39.[119] If this is the case, then, we have 3 readings in Jn 10 where P^{45} inserts a conjunction in order to remove asyndeton. That these 3 cases in P^{45} all occur within a single chapter would seem simply to confirm that Johannine style countenances asyndeton to an unusual degree.[120]

To these 20 readings of omission and addition we must add 9 cases where one conjunction is replaced by another conjunction:[121]

και becomes δε: Lk 10:8; Ac 7:58a, 9:18b.

δε becomes και: Ac 12:20, 13:13b.

η becomes και: Mt 25:44.

τε becomes και: Ac 9:18a.

δε becomes γαρ: Lk 11:11a.

And in Ac 13:52 τε (or less likely δε) is changed to γε:[122] an obvious misreading of ΤЄ as ΓЄ.

Five of these are harmonizations to context: Mt 25:44; Lk 10:8, 11:11a; Ac 9:18a, 12:20. Besides these and the visual lapsus at Ac 13:52 there remain 3 cases (each involving και and δε) which are unexplained.

Perhaps under this heading should also be noted the shift from και to την at Lk 13:22. Birdsall suggests that the creation of asyndeton between participles here "might be a stylistic correction."[123] It seems also possible that the addition of the article before πορειαν could have been felt necessary, perhaps understood as "making his journey toward Jerusalem."[124]

Pronouns.--We have already noted that P^{45} adds only 3 pronouns (Ac 9:39a, 11:11, 13:25b), the first and last being harmonizations to context, but omits 11 pronouns, twice perhaps by homoeoteleuton.[125] In this category the tendency to omit inessential words (and thus to create conciseness) and the tendency to improve style may indeed coincide. For instance, Kilpatrick observes:

> Another category of variation which sometimes involved slight differences of meaning is the presence or absence of possessive pronouns with nouns, and of pronouns or pronoun phrases with verbs. . . . The older explanation still to be found in commentaries and other discussions is that such variations, especially where they involved expansion of the text, were due to a desire to produce a smoother text.[126] . . . When we look at the Greek writers on style from Dionysius of Halicarnassus onward, we find that their criteria are different. For them the better style would be usually the briefer.[127]

The shift from του θεου to αυτου at Jn 11:4 should perhaps also be considered an example of P^{45}'s tendency toward brevity, since one word replaces two.[128] But it seems also possible that the scribe preferred to avoid repeating του θεου from the previous clause.[129] However, invoking this latter explanation would be rather dubious in view of P^{45}'s quite strong tendency to harmonize to the context, and thus to repeat nearby words.

Finally, we may note the shift from αυτοι to ουτοι at Ac 13:14, as well as the possibility that the addition of μοι at Ac 11:11 is tied up with the omission of μου at Ac 11:8.[130]

Cases.--Tarelli finds what he calls a "dative quasi-absolute" at Mk 9:28a;[131] however, this example is in fact just the result of harmonization to context. Similar examples are Mt 26:6a and Lk 9:53b.

P^{45} does show a preference for the genitive of time at Lk 9:37 and Ac 16:18b,[132] prefers the genitive[133] with επι at Lk 12:51, and uses δια plus the genitive instead of the accusative at Ac 15:41b. Although the last example can be seen as a harmonization to context, there is clearly some general stylistic preference here, but it is not clear what the reason behind it is.

Adjectives.--An unexplained change in word order occurs with ο καλος ποιμην at Jn 10:11a and 10:11b. (D makes this same shift at Jn 10:14, where P^{45} returns to ο ποιμην ο καλος.) Tarelli calls the singular construction of P^{45} "feebler."[134] The reverse change is made at Ac 4:31, probably under the influence of the context. A case of substitution of adjectives occurs at Lk 10:42.

At Ac 13:46c αιωνιος is treated as an adjective with three endings. This might be viewed as a move to Attic standards,[135] although the evidence for this is far from clear.[136] There is, furthermore, some tendency in later Greek to form feminine forms,[137] and the variants with αιωνιος in the New Testament show this fluctuation.[138] The reading of P[45] is a witness to the intrusion of the feminine form, and should indeed be seen as perhaps one way in which the context can make its influence felt.

P[45] is alone in omitting forms of πας at Lk 12:27 and Ac 10:33a, apparently for no reason other than the tendency to conciseness.[139]

Prefixes.--Colwell claimed that the scribe of P[45] "prefers the simple to the compound word."[140] In fact, there are 5 omissions of prefixes and only 3 additions of prefixes. Such a preference for the simple forms might be caused by the desire to move from Koine standards back to classical ones,[141] or may just be the result of P[45]'s general trend toward brevity.

The omission of prefixes occurs at Lk 10:40b, 12:1a; Jn 11:44 (harmonization to context); Ac 9:39a, 10:31. In the first two of these cases a return to classical forms is a possible explanation. For (in Lk 10:40b) συναντιλαμβανω is first attested in the third century B.C., while the verbs used by P[45] and D are found two centuries earlier. And (in Lk 12:1a) επισυναγω is first found in the LXX, but συναγω goes back to Homer.

The addition of prefixes occurs at Mk 7:33b;

Lk 10:35, 11:22a. At Lk 10:35 the simple form (αυριον) is attested from Homer on, while the compound form (επαυριον) occurs only from the third century B.C., and P^{45} moves to the later form. Note further that P^{45} exchanges prefixes at Ac 10:38 for no apparent reason.

Proper Names.--Eight of our singulars involve variation in proper names.[142]

At Ac 9:38 P^{45} writes Λυνδα as the genitive of Λυδδα. (The other occurrences of Λυδδα at Ac 9:32 and 9:35 are not extant in P^{45}.) Treating this name as indeclinable agrees with ℵ^{c} A,[143] and the presence of -νδ- for -δδ- is also found in the singular Σανδουκαιων of Ac 5:17. I have not found other examples of -νδ- for -δδ- in Greek,[144] but such confusion is known from Aramaic.[145] Given, though, the Egyptian origin of P^{45} we should perhaps look to Coptic for possible influence here, and in fact it sometimes happens that an ⲛ is prefixed to a ⲇ in Greek words written in Coptic: ⲛⲇⲉ for δε is an example.[146] The fact that the Coptic version reads ⲗⲩⲇⲇⲁ at all three occurrences in Acts and ⲥⲁⲇⲇⲟⲩⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ at Ac 5:17 casts some doubt on the likelihood of such influence. But in any case some sound confusion is evident at these two readings.

In the majority of manuscripts of Acts, Σαουλ occurs only as the name of the first king of Israel (13:21), and as a vocative within the accounts of Saul's conversion: 9:4 *bis*, 9:17, 22:7 *bis*, 22:13, 26:14 *bis*. Σαυλος occurs at fifteen other places.[147] At four of these texts P^{45} is extant, and it reads Σαουλ at all four: 7:58b, 9:24, 11:30, 13:7. Thus, the scribe doubtless wrote Σαουλ in place of Σαυλος throughout Acts.[148] In fact, Σαουλ is the form closer to the Hebrew שָׁאוּל, in contrast to the Hellenized Σαυλος. And the scribe's decision to write Σαουλ uniformly is probably one aspect of his tendency to harmonize, since he stays with his form throughout (it appears), despite reading the other form in his *Vorlage*.

At Jn 11:2b P^{45} has Λαζαρ in place of Λαζαρος. At the other two occurrences of the name where P^{45} is extant (Jn 11:1, 11:5), we find Λαζαρος and Λαζαρον. It is thus likely that Kenyon is correct in dismissing the spelling at 11:2 as a slip.[149]

On the other hand, this spelling could be a less Hellenized rendering of the Hebrew אֶלְעָזָר. Zuntz claims, moreover, that Λαζαρ results from Coptic influence:

> A truly Coptic element in truly Egyptian manuscripts would not be surprising. P^{45} contains at least one such, namely Λάζαρ for Λαζαρος in Jn. xi. 2.[150]

However, I have failed to find any support for such a claim. The Coptic has ⲗⲁⲍⲁⲣⲟⲥ throughout Jn 11-12, except for 11:43 where the Greek Λαζαρε is just transliterated.[151] At 11:43, in fact, the Greek evidence is divided: Λαζαρε ς ℵ^{c} rell : Λαζαρε Λαζαρε C^{3} eth^{ro}: Λαζαρ ℵ*. The fact that ℵ* here writes what P^{45} writes in 11:2 is, it appears, coincidental.

At Jn 11:1 P^{45} has Βηθανιαμ instead of Βηθανιας. Here the Hebrew original provides no ground for the -ιαμ (בֵּית עֲנְיָה).[152] Perhaps the scribe was influenced by the somewhat similar Βηθλεεμ to write the final μ.

Special Cases.--There are a few readings which involve significant shifts in meaning or special problems of interpretation.

At Lk 9:50 P^{45} replaces the striking saying by the bland text: "he is neither against us nor for us." Colwell says that "P^{45} straightens out the hard saying,"[153] and such an alteration of meaning must have involved deliberate change.

Birdsall discusses the "quite distinct form of words" at Lk 11:15, and cites Merk's characterization of the reading as "lectio . . . sensus satis obscuri."[154] The addition is puzzling, but I believe that Tarelli's explanation is most plausible:[155] the scribe was influenced by εθαυμασαν οι οχλοι λεγοντες in the parallel passage at Mt 9:33.[156] But, under the influence of the preceding ελαλησεν the scribe wrote ελαλησαν, an easy enough shift. And the word οχυροι then is seen as a misreading, or even mishearing,[157] of οχλοι. Although this is a complex process, the sound change postulated is possible,[158] and in any case something quite unusual has clearly happened in our scribe's normal method of copying.

At Lk 12:47 P[45]'s omission of μη ετοιμασας η (vel μηδε)[159] makes Jesus say: "that servant who knew his master's will and acted according to his will, shall receive a severe beating." Obviously some oversight by the scribe accounts for his introducing such a hard saying, but as usual what he writes makes sense.

At the difficult variation of Ac 13:33 the citation of Ps 2:7 is introduced as from the second Psalm (in most manuscripts), from the first Psalm (D it Origen), from just "the Psalm" (522 1175), or from "the Psalms" (P^{45}). The decision between "first" and "second" need not concern us here, for this is doubtless just one more case of our scribe's removing a difficulty. Already in the third century the scribe of P^{45} must have felt a difficulty in whatever text he read (or perhaps remembered another text), and so took the easy way out by writing the safely non-specific τοις ψαλμοις.[160]

Summary.--The basic features of the copying by the scribe of P^{45} were already isolated by Colwell, whose comments have been cited frequently. The resulting profile of scribal activity indicates that the errors introduced by the scribe can be seen as being, for the most part, the results of the following five characteristics, which are presented in descending order of importance.

I. The scribe is concerned to produce a readable text, and is successful in reaching this goal with virtually no correction by himself or anyone else. As a consequence, there are few nonsense readings, few corrections, few obvious errors. There are also some examples of the simplification of difficult texts or constructions.

II. The scribe has a marked tendency to omit portions of the text, often (as it seems) accidentally but perhaps also by deliberate pruning. As suggested above, the majority of transpositions can be accounted for by the combined influence of characteristics I and II.[161]

III. Harmonization is a frequent cause of error, with harmonization to the immediate context being the most important type.

IV. Stylistic and grammatical improvements are sometimes attempted, and the influence of Attic or Classical standards is on occasion,[162] but not always,[163] felt.

V. Our scribe is, apart from his errors by leaps, rather rarely subject to certain errors of sight, perhaps also of hearing, of influences of similar forms, and simply of oversight.

Addendum.--To the list of singulars should be added:

** Lk 6:48 δια το καλως οικοδομησθαι αυτην P^{75} ℵ B L W
Ξ 33 892 1241 pc : om P^{45vid} pr sp 700* syr^{s} :
τεθεμελιωτο γαρ επι την πετραν ς rell

Kenyon does note this omission (by a leap from αυτην to αυτην), but does not note the support.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The suggested datings cited in Kurt Aland, ed., *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*, Vol. I: *Biblische Papyri*, Patristische Texte und Studien, Vol. 18 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1976), p. 269, range from the beginning to the end of the third century. P^{45}'s editor, Frederic G. Kenyon (*The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Vol. II: *The Gospels and Acts, Text* [London: Emery Walker, 1933], p. x), says: "The date which I should assign to it is the third century, and the first half of it rather than the second." The emphasis here appears somewhat different in Aland's citation of "III A" (i.e. "Anfang des III. Jahrhunderts"). The date may safely be taken as *ca*. 250.

[2] Kenyon, *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, pp. v-viii.

[3] *Ibid*., p. v, and Aland, *Repertorium*, p. 269.

[4] Aland, *Repertorium*, p. 269. The identification of these fragments as belonging to P^{45} was made by Hans Gerstinger, who published the text in "Ein Fragment des Chester Beatty-Evangelienkodex in der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien," *Aegyptus*, 13 (1933), pp. 67-72. Günther Zuntz later undertook a detailed study of this folio, and published his findings along with a photograph of the Vienna papyrus in his "Reconstruction of one Leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P^{45})," *Chronique d'Égypte*, 26 (1951), pp. 191-211. A few corrections by Zuntz to his article may be found in Marcel Hombert, "Bulletin papyrologique XXV (1951)," *Revue des études grecques*, 66 (1953), p. 313.

[5] Kenyon, *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, p. vii; Aland, *Repertorium*, p.269.

[6] Kenyon, *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, p. xii (tables of agreement) and p. xv. Cf. also Epp, "Interlude," pp. 394-96.

[7] Kenyon, *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, pp. xi-xviii.

[8] *Ibid*., p. xviii.

[9] *Ibid*., p. ix.

[10] *Ibid*., pp. viii-x, on P^{45}'s "writing."

[11] That is, in *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, along with a few corrections in Kenyon's *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Vol. II: *The Gospels and Acts, Plates* (London: Emery Walker, 1934), pp. v-vi.

[12] Kenyon relies primarily on Tischendorf, with some additional information from various sources; cf. *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, pp. xx-xxi. However, he did not use von Soden. Certain oversights and errors are discussed in note 17 below and further in this chapter.

[13] *The Gospels and Acts, Plates*. For folio 8 Kenyon's transcription (*The Gospels and Acts, Text*, pp. 51-52) uses some fragments which do not appear in the plates. This makes a difference only at Mk 12:14, where the published plate shows: [δω]μ̣εν ου[ν η μη δω]μεν.

[14] These are the agreements with W at Mk 9:2a; Lk 10:11b, 10:13, and 12:33; and with 1241 at Lk 11:21. The other agreements with W or Θ are noted in von Soden, except for the agreement with Θ at Jn 10:31 and the agreements with W at Lk 11:18 and Jn 11:22, each of which is cited in Nestle-Aland. Harris' collation also provides the citation of 892 at Lk 10:11b.

[15] Mk 6:39b, which is supported by 122. The editions of S. C. E. Legg cover only Matthew and Mark: *Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum, Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), and *Evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940).

[16] The support by P^{75} at Lk 11:31, and the support by P^{66} at Jn 11:22, 11:30, and 11:32, are noted in Nestle-Aland. However, the support by P^{75} at Lk 13:31 is not found in Nestle-Aland (the variation is not cited), although the support from W is already noted in von Soden. The editors read P^{75} as having the reading of P^{45} at Jn 10:36. but P^{75} is, I believe, too doubtful to be cited there.

[17] Our total of 240 singulars includes 6 taken from the reconstruction by Zuntz of folio 2 (Mt 26:1, 26:5, 26:6a, 26:6b, 26:12, 26:21a); thus, we found 234 in the material edited by Kenyon. Kenyon, however, cites 254 singulars in his tables (*The Gospels and Acts, Text*, pp.

xii-xiv), and his apparatus notes 284. The discrepancies of our totals with his apparatus are accounted for as follows:

Matthew: Kenyon's apparatus has 4, but his table gives 3. He counts 1 variant at 20:31 instead of 2, and he misreads βηθανιαν at 21:17 as βαιθανιαν (see the plate). So we end up with 4 here (plus the 6 from Zuntz). Also, I have divided the reading at 25:43 into 2 readings, one of which is non-singular. And at 20:29 Kenyon fails to note that only ℵ* supports P^{45}'s omission of αυτω.

Mark: Kenyon's apparatus has 28, but his table gives 30. He fails to note 4 singulars: 6:48b (Kenyon claims support here from 565. Legg, apparently Kenyon's source [cf. *ibid.*, p. xx], cites "ηθλεν *sic* P^{45}*uid*. 565." Since P^{45} clearly has [ηλ]θεν, I assume that 565 does *not* support.), 7:33a, 9:7, 12:26. Kenyon also counts 1 variant instead of 2 at 2 places (6:41, 9:28b-c). Thus, we have 6 singulars which he misses. But he also misses Greek manuscript support for 3 readings: 6:39b (see note 15 above), 7:7 (= 69$^{corr\ recens}$), 7:15. Furthermore, he has 9:23 as singular, although this should be divided into 2 non-singular readings (om το cum D K Θ Π f^{13} 28 565 700^{c} al, om πιστευσαι/δυνασαι cum ℵ* B W Δ f^{1} 892). And Kenyon misreads 9:31, where P^{45} has παρα[δι]δοται ε[ις] with ς rell. So we end up with 29 singulars here.

Luke: Kenyon's apparatus has 121, but his table has 116. He counts 1 variant instead of 2 at 2 places (11:7, 12:52a-b), and does not cite 12:36b; thus we have 3 singulars more than he does. But 3 of his singulars are not included: at 6:35 P^{45} may read [αυ]τος [χρς], which is supported by the αυτος χριστος of Ξ pc; at 10:21 P^{45}'s τω πνευματι should be divided into 2 non-singular readings (om τω αγιω cum ς pm, om ο ιησους [Nestle-Aland cites P^{45vid} here] cum P^{75} ℵ B D Ξ 1241 pc); and again at 10:21 P^{45} does not omit ναι ο πατηρ οτι, but reads it followed by ουτως ευδοκια εγενετο (cum P^{75} B C* L al), since the letters εγ are clearly visible after ευδοκια (Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 119, accepts Kenyon's text).

At 3 other places Kenyon prints a text not supported by his plates: at 7:2 P^{45} has δ[ουλο]ς, at 10:19 it reads διδωμι, and at 14:30 it has [εκτε]λεσαι. Moreover, he counts 2 singulars instead of 1 at 10:40a.

And at 29 places Kenyon fails to note Greek manuscript support for readings: 9:36a, 9:48a, 9:48b, 9:62 (where the 3 readings cited agree with D [cf. *The Gospels and Acts, Plates*, p. vi]), 10:13, 10:15, 11:11 (B 234 also read και), 11:13, 11:19b, 11:21, 11:22b, 11:30, 11:31, 11:38, 11:42c, 12:1b, 12:4, 12:8a, 12:9, 12:53, 12:58b, 13:8, 13:15a, 13:17 (D also omits παντες [cf. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 1270]), 13:31, 14:23b, 14:29.

Thus, we arrive at 88 singulars for Luke.

John: Kenyon's apparatus cites 30, but his table gives 25. He counts 2 singulars instead of 1 at 10:34-35, misses Greek manuscript support for 10:42 (= 16), and misreads αρουσιν as αιρουσιν at 11:48 (the ερουσιν of Θ would, by itacism, support αιρουσιν anyway). Also, I have not included 11:33, since this should be divided into 2 non-singular readings (αυτη cum ς pm, word order cum D). Thus, we have 26 singulars here.

Acts: Kenyon's apparatus has 101, but his table cites 80. He counts 2 singulars instead of 1 at 15:7 (this is discussed in detail below), and counts 1 singular instead of 2 at 11:29, 13:13, and 13:25. He misses 17:12c and 17:13, and fails to include 7:12. At 3 other places Kenyon prints a text not supported by the plates: at 7:55 P^{45} has ειδεν, at 10:17 the space seems to be enough for εν εαυτω or εν αυτω, and at 16:3 there is an ο (or something) before παυ[λος]. And at 8:17 Kenyon combines the 2 non-singular readings to get a singular.

At 13 places Kenyon misses Greek manuscript support: 7:60, 8:36, 10:20, 10:21, 11:28 (μελλειν is omitted by 4* 61 314 al), 13:47, 13:49, 14:19a, 15:5 (D 2138 also omit των pri), 16:3a, 16:33a, 17:11, 17:12a. And there are 2 remaining readings which are unclear. At 7:39 Kenyon says that P^{45} omits εις αιγυπτον, which would be singular. But considerations of space make it more likely that this phrase has been transposed to before εν, and indeed the γ, υ, and ο of αιγυπτον are visible there. Thus, P^{45} would agree with 623 (according to von Soden). At 16:39, if αυτους is in fact omitted, P^{45} would agree with 383 (according to von Soden).

Thus, we end up with 87 singulars here.

In connection with his comments concerning the 17th edition of Nestle-Aland, Kilpatrick ("Three Recent Editions of the Greek New Testament," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 50 [1949], p. 15) suggests 7 readings for P^{45}, all of which involve the reconstructed folio 2. At

Mt 26:31 and 26:36 Kilpatrick suggests the readings which we take from Zuntz. However, at 26:1, 26:13, and 26:19, I have followed Zuntz rather than Kilpatrick; thus, we have our 26:1 (cf. Zuntz, "Reconstruction," p. 199) and our 26:12 (cf. *ibid*., p. 200). Also, Zuntz (*ibid*., p. 211) thinks that, contrary to Kilpatrick, P^{45} did not omit ο ιησους at 26:19; but in any case the omission would be supported by 074 (according to von Soden). Kilpatrick's suggestions of υπαγετε at 25:41 and of the omission of μαϑητων at 26:20 are confirmed by Zuntz (*ibid*., p. 198 and p. 201; indeed the latter is already noted by Kenyon), but are not singular: the former is supported by ℵ 1424, the latter by B D pm.

The following points were also noted along the way. At Mt 26:15 we follow Zuntz's proposal (*ibid*., p. 201) that P^{45} read λ' στατηρας ϰαι απο ϰτλ., thus having no singular here. At Lk 10:19 Tischendorf's text mistakenly reads ημας for υμας (with no manuscript support, thus confirming how easily this confusion can occur). At Lk 10:42 Kenyon's text has αφηρεϑησεται for αφαιρεϑησεται (on the plate), and at Lk 14:17 ειπεν for ειπειν (on the plate). Finally, at Lk 9:48a and Ac 12:20 the symbol $\underline{K}^{r}$ is taken from von Soden.

[18] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 111, says that P^{45} has 275 singulars after removal of itacisms. (See Chapter I for various differences between his method of collating and the one adopted here.) In my "Scribal Habits," p. 152, I gave the figure of 248, which was based on a collation that did not use Legg or 1241, and used the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland instead of the 26th edition. In a few cases, too, I have revised my view on how units of variation should be counted.

[19] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 110, claims that "P^{45} has approximately 90" itacistic spellings, of which about three-fourths are ει for ι. He also says that P^{45} never moves from ε to αι, and only once interchanges ο and ω (*ibid*., p. 111). This last reading must be Ac 13:12, where the scribe has corrected himself. No interchanges of ο and ω are found in our list of singulars.

[20] BDF, §14. For the general interchanges of τ and ϑ, and of ϰ and χ, see Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 86-96 (where the influence of Coptic is cited at p. 95).

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 208-11 (and p. 209 n. 1, where there is a reference to "the freq. δῶναι for δοῦναι"). In fact, δωναι is an Arcadian aorist infinitive of διδωμι; cf. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. Henry Stuart Jones (9th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1940), *s.v.* (This work, along with *A Supplement*, ed. E. A. Barber [Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], is cited as 'LSJ.')

[22] Cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 86-96. The word εκει at Ac 15:21b would be nonsense in context.

[23] Gignac, *ibid.*, p. 125, discusses such loss before a vowel, and his next to last example is parallel to the reading in P45.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 125-26. The preceding εις may have aided the addition of ς; the word τις would be nonsense in context.

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 306-7; our example fits the pattern of loss "of an unaccented (etymologically short) vowel *after* a liquid or nasal when the preceding or following *syllable* has the same vowel."

[26] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 112.

[27] *Ibid.* Colwell seems to have counted 25 nonsense readings in P45 (the difference between 275 and 250 on pp. 111-12).

[28] Occasioned perhaps by the preceding πεισαντες. Gignac also discusses omissions of syllables (*Grammar*, pp. 312-13), noting that many of these are "scribal errors without significance for the pronunciation of the word."

[29] Such slackening of attention is often commented on; cf. Colwell, "Grouping," *Studies*, p. 23.

[30] I exclude here such readings as Lk 9:50 and 12:47, which are not nonsense even though what sense they have is rather strange.

[31] Here the scribe may have skipped from αυτον pri to αυτον sec, then copied εις, found his place again, but not corrected the εις.

[32] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 115.

[33] Kenyon, *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, p. ix, says that the abbreviation "πς appears to be unknown." It is not quite clear here what the abbreviation was, and some correction in it may have occurred. But the scribe most likely thought that he was writing του πατρος. I have accordingly not counted this as orthographic omission of final -ς; cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 124-25.

[34] These are (I suppose) the 2 leaps backward from the same to the same referred to by Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 112. Note that another repetition has been corrected by the scribe at Lk 9:58.

[35] Kenyon's printed text is quite inadequate. In *The Gospels and Acts, Plates*, p. vi, he notes:

> "It is pointed out by Bunner and Couchoud that there appears to have been some repetition of the text of xv. 2. The papyrus apparently had:
>
> π[ο]λλης δ[ε] ζητ[ησεως
> γενομενης τωι παυλωι και τωι βαρναβα . . . ."

And this reconstruction is followed by the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland (cited as "$p^{45(vid)}$"). However, the γενομενης is, at the very least, dubious, and a right bracket has evidently fallen out.

In fact, the plate shows what is clearly not an N, but is more likely a Γ before HC; thus, ζητ̣[ησεως ουκ ολι]γης is more probable than Kenyon's ζητησεως γενομενης. Consequently, the scribe leaped back from ζητησεως of vs. 7 to ζητησεως of vs. 2, continued with ουκ ολιγης -- πρεσβυτερους, caught his error, and then picked up again with γενομενης of vs. 7, but did not (it seems) correct the inserted text. The leap which is supposed by Kenyon and Nestle-Aland would be considerably less plausible (γενομεν*ης* . . . ολιγ*ης*).

[36] Zuntz, "Reconstruction," p. 198, says: "Ουκ before εδωκατε, omitted (cf. v. 35) by the original scribe (as in B), was added by a later hand."

[37] Kenyon does not comment on this correction, but the addition seems certainly to be by a second hand; compare the added ς here with that added at Ac 5:38.

[38] The correction of the same error in B (cf. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 1259) was made already by B^2, the διορθωτής who "eiusdem

fere aetatis atque B* sive manus prima fuit" (*ibid*., p. 360).

[39] Colwell includes this reading among his harmonizations to the immediate context ("Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 113).

[40] See BDF, §366(4).

[41] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 117.

[42] *Ibid*., p. 116 (and see p. 112 on leaps).

[43] See BDF, §276(1), and Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. by Gordon M. Messing (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), §§1143-44.

[44] The naturalness of such an addition may be verified by noting the "this Mary" of the New English Bible and Today's English Version.

[45] See BDF, §200: "The temporal dative in answer to the question 'when?' is still quite common in the NT, in addition, of course, to the use of ἐν for clarification; the latter was already widespread in the classical language." Cf. §200(3).

[46] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 119, remarks: "In Acts 14:15 the over-concise Greek is clarified by the addition of a verb, 'turn away from.'" Note that D and E clarify in another way.

[47] Cf. *ibid*., pp. 112, 118-19.

[48] See Kenyon, *The Gospels and Acts, Plates*, p. vi, for an alternative reading. I believe that the omission cited here is more likely, but it is in any case clear that there is a major omission, probably by homoeoteleuton; for details see note 54 below.

[49] There is doubt here as to the *Vorlage* of P^{45}, but P^{45} has the shortest reading, and so has omitted something.

[50] The 24 words added in the nonsense reading at Ac 15:7 would narrow this loss, but only somewhat.

[51] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, pp. 118-19. Actually, as we have already seen, P^{45} does have a partially (but only partially) compensating habit of addition.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 119. Three of Colwell's alleged omissions are incorrect. At Mk 6:48a της νυκτος is not omitted, but is transposed to before φυλακην. (This reading supposes that P^{45} omits σφοδρα και with א B L Δ 892 pc, or at least omits σφοδρα with ς A D f^1 pm. On this view, P^{45} originally had:

καιαυτοςμονοςεπιτηςγηςκαιειδεναυτουςβασανιζομενουςι

εντωελαυνεινηνγαροανεμοςεναντιοςαυτοιςπεριτεταρτην

τηςνυκτοςφυλακηνερχεταιπροςαυτουςπεριπατωνεπιτηςθα

λασσηςκαιηλθενπαρελθειν . . .

These lines fit the space well, although I confess that I cannot place the remains after αυτοις on either this reading or Kenyon's. Nestle-Aland (26th edition) also cite 'P^{45}vid' for the omission of της νυκτος, and thus suppose that it had σφοδρα και.) At Lk 10:21 P^{45} does not omit ναι ο πατηρ οτι (see note 17 above). And at Ac 8:36 P^{45} is supported by 2145 in the omission of ιδου υδωρ (2145 has, though, also substituted ειπεν προς τον φιλιππον for φησιν ο ευνουχος).

[53] Perhaps a similar leap accounts for the reading at Ac 10:39a (ημεις εσμεν). By the way, I suspect that the agreement between P^{45}, 245, and several versional manuscripts in omitting Lk 12:9 may well be due to coincidence. Indeed, with two consecutive verses ending in των αγγελων του θεου (or the versional equivalents), the wonder is that not more manuscripts skipped the verse.

[54] Kenyon's text reads here:

ο δε̣[
σκεις[
και εν ο̣λη[
πεν δε ά̣υτ[ωι

And his note reads: "Verba quaedam omissa, ut vid. propter spatium, fortasse αποκριθεις et και τον πλησιον σου ως ϲεαυτον, vel plura." On the other hand, in *The Gospels and Acts, Plates*, p. vi, he cites Bunner for the the following reconstruction:

> σκεις ο δε ειπεν αγαπησεις κ̅ν̅ τον θ̅ν̅ εν οληι τηι
> /καρδια σου
> και εν οληι τηι ψυχηι σου και τον πλησιον σου ως
> /σεαυτον ει

(Kenyon has εαυτον for σεαυτον, a nice haplography.)

However, this reconstruction supposes two scribal errors: the omission of αποκριθεις (unknown in Greek) and the leap later on from ψυχηι *σου* διανοια *σου*. But the following reconstruction requires only one leap and seems to fit the space well:

> σκεις ο δε αποκριθεις ειπεν αγαπησεις κ̅ν̅ τον θ̅ν̅ σου
> και εν οληι τηι διανοια σου και τον πλησιον σου ως
> /σεαυτον ει

(It is true, though, that Bunner's lines each have 47 letters, while mine have 42 and 49 letters.)

[55] The fact that this omission can be explained as a leap makes it likely that the versional support is only coincidental, since the same leap would be possible in any language. This verse poses many problems, of course; see Metzger, *Commentary*, pp. 429-34.

[56] Metzger, *ibid*., p. 371, calls this omission "probably accidental."

[57] See BDF, §278, and Kilpatrick, "The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the *Textus Receptus*," *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective*, ed. H. Anderson and W. Barclay (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), p. 204.

[58] LSJ cite the substantive use of τα παροιχομενα, but not of the feminine.

[59] Elsewhere in the NT, of course, such words are understood; cf. BDF, §241(2).

[60] Such a construction would be correct; see BDF, §370. Note that the parallel at Mk 14:2 has μη ... μηποτε.

[61] This is an explanation presented by Metzger, Commentary, p. 234. Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xii), Anchor Bible, Vol. 29 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), p. 425, says: "Omission is really harder to explain than addition, unless the mention of resurrection alone in vs. 24 would have had some influence." We shall see below that the influence of the context often played a role in the readings of P^{45}, and we have already seen that omission is in fact more common in P^{45} than addition. It may also be noted that the "accident in transcription" suggested by Metzger would perhaps be slightly easier in Syriac than in Greek or Latin, since "resurrection" and "life" end with the same letter (ܩܝܡܬܐ ܘܚܝܐ).

By the way, the patristic support cited here is questionable. Nestle-Aland cite Cyprian and Origen, while the United Bible Societies edition cites Cyprian, Origen, and Titus of Bostra. However, Gordon D. Fee, in his review of Metzger's Commentary in Biblica, 55 (1974), p. 454, says: "Likewise, to include Origen and Titus of Bostra as a part of the 'puzzling omission of και η ζωη' in Jn 11,25 is quite wrong, since neither Father cites the full text of the verse with these words missing." In his "Modern Text Criticism," p. 160, Fee warns: "A 'shorter text' in the Fathers must always be used with caution," and goes on in n. 40 (on p. 217) to discuss Jn 11:25a.

[62] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 116. Cf. also Hoskier, Text, pp. xxvii-viii: "It is most tempting to a scribe after having skipped something, especially in a long list, to add the words which have been overlooked and to admit them tacitly later in the verse."

[63] Colwell, following Kenyon, regarded this as an omission; see note 52 above.

[64] David P. Davies, "The Position of Adverbs in Luke," Studies in New Testament Language and Text, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 106-21, analyzes Luke's placement of adverbs, and concludes (p. 119) that P^{45} is clearly secondary here.

[65] I consider this simply as a transposition, since the omission of την is supported by B Θ.

[66] Colwell counts--besides his 5 homoeoteleuta--37 cases of carelessness ("Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 116). We may note that the transposition at Mk 6:37 to υμεις φαγειν αυτοις gives what D 1354 read at the parallel at Mt 14:16. And it is barely possible that Lk 12:7a was influenced by Mt 10:30, which has υμων even earlier.

[67] Davies, "Position of Adverbs," pp. 118-19, discusses this variation and concludes, despite some conflicting evidence, that the P^{75} ℵ B L reading "should probably be accepted as original."

[68] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 116.

[69] *Ibid*., p. 117.

[70] Depending on the Vorlage, Lk 12:28a might involve 5 words, but it is here counted as involving only 4.

[71] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 120. In the case of Jn 10:34-35 there is also the shift from η γραφη to εν τη γραφη, but this is clearly just a consequence of the transposition. By the way, Colwell does not cite Mt 26:12 (the second longest transposition) since he does not take account of the readings found on the basis of the Vienna papyrus, but utilizes only Kenyon (see *ibid*., p. 108 n. 3).

[72] As Colwell notes (*ibid*., p. 117), P^{66} corrects his omissions in this way: "P^{66} gives the impression of working in a controlled situation. If he catches a transposition while he is writing, he erases the out-of-order word and writes the correct-order-word over it. If the transposition is caught later, strokes between lines correct it. This never happens in P^{45}."

[73] *Ibid*.: "He [the scribe of P^{45}] feels free to make the order of words what he wants to make it, and he is a careful workman. He does not fall into the slips and nonsense that P^{66} does."

[74] D omits πολλω at Lk 18:39.

[75] At Mk 9:4 D Θ f^1 565 have adopted Lk 9:30's συνελαλουν.

[76] See BDF, §128(7).

[77] Of course, the variation here is a matter merely of the similar sounding η and αι; cf. Gignac, Grammar, pp. 247-48, where αποθηκαιν for αποθηκην is cited from a third-century document. Incidentally, the Syriac support for P^{45} here is rather dubious. Von Soden cites the Syriac as having ταμεια and αποθηκαι, but the difference between ταμειον and ταμεια would appear only in the pointing (ܬܘܢܐ and ܬܘ̈ܢܐ [ܬܰܘܳܢܳܐ and ܬܰܘ̈ܳܢܶܐ]). Moreover, it seems at least possible that ܒܝܬ ܩܦܣܐ should render αποθηκη; see J. Payne Smith, ed., A Compendious Syriac Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903), p. 514, where we find: " ܒܶܝܬ ܩܶܦ̈ܣܶܐ a storehouse, barn, magazine."

[78] Colwell ("Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 113) underestimates the extent of harmonization to parallels, since he says that only 10 cases occur in the three papyri he studies. He cites our Lk 11:12 and 12:24a.

[79] Ibid. Von Soden recognized the importance of such influence and regularly explains readings in his apparatus by citing nearby verses as well as parallels within parentheses. See his general statement (Text und Apparat, p. XXIV): "Ist die Variante durch eine Reminiscenz veranlasst, so wird die Quellstelle in Klammern beigefügt." In his prolegomena von Soden often refers to harmonizations of various sorts; cf. Die Schriften, Untersuchungen, p. 1422 (on the Gospels):

> "Der weitaus grösste Teil der Varianten zwischen den drei Rezensionen ist, wie schon alle unsere Beobachtungen an den Typen und den Einzelcodd nicht anders erwarten lassen, durch Paralleleinwirkungen veranlasst. Und zwar nicht nur Einwirkungen der genauen Parallelen. Sondern auch bloss verwandte Stellen, ja bloss verwandte Wendungen, Reminiszenzen im weitesten Sinne des Wortes wirken, am häufigsten gewiss unbeabsichtigt und unbewusst, auf die Gestaltung des Textes unausgesetzt ein."

And with respect to Acts von Soden says (ibid., p. 1698):

> "Die Hauptmasse aller Varianten ist in Ac so gut wie in Evv durch Parallelen im weitesten Sinn des Wortes veranlasst. D. h. nicht nur durch die Ausdrucksweise in wirklichen Parallelen, z. B. den drei Erzählungen von des Paulus Bekehrung oder ähnlichen Wundertaten

oder Reiseerlebnissen, sondern auch durch blosse Wortanklänge, und oft genug durch den unmittelbaren Kontext, der dem Schreiber im Ohre lag oder das Auge beeinflusste."

Von Soden also gives several lists of readings created by the influence of parallels or the context at *ibid*., pp. 1698-1703, 1825-26, and 1900-1. He separates, though, these two classes of readings within the Pauline epistles from Romans 6 on, and lists the "Varianten in Folge von Einwirkungen des unmittelbaren Kontextes" on pp. 1908-10 (§473), and "Die übrigen Paralleleinwirkungen oder Reminiszenzen" on pp. 1910-15 (§474).

[80] There are 4 further cases which give nonsense readings; see p. 121 above on Ac 14:19c (cf. note 25) and Lk 10:34b, 11:20; Ac 16:38b.

[81] See p. 125. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 113, cites Mt 25:43b under this topic.

[82] Colwell, *ibid*., also cites the corrected Mk 6:22; see p. 123 *above*.

[83] Note that the first occurrence of αναστας is directly above the second in the codex.

[84] Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 365, says that this reading "is a scribal modification, introduced perhaps under the influence of the similar phrase in ver. 23."

[85] See pp. 134-35.

[86] See p. 131.

[87] Some of the other grammatical changes to be discussed further below may also be considered as being, in a very general way, influenced by the context.

[88] This is a difficult text. Luke apparently wrote the Attic aorist εγημα in place of the Hellenistic εγαμησα (BDF, §101 *s.v.*). Kenyon transcribes η̣γα/μη̣κ̣α̣, an otherwise unattested form which might be an attempt to write a perfect. However, the plate--imperfect as such evidence may be--does not confirm Kenyon's transcription (which, as we saw above in note 17, is not always accurate).

Let us examine the top line of the left hand portion of f. 15^{r}. At the right end, the lower portion of the κ (of the following και) is clearly visible. To the left of that we see the lower right and lower left remains of an λ (α). And to the left of the α is the lower portion of the preceding letter: ✓ . This can hardly be the remains of a K. Rather, I suggest that it is the remains of a C, which our scribe often makes with a sharp angle at the lower left; see, for example, his writing of γεμισθη toward the right six lines further down, where we find C.

If my transcription is correct, what has happened is clearly that the scribe was led by the two preceding occurrences of ηγορασα into writing the Hellenistic aorist of γαμεω with η as augment. The manuscripts of the NT, of course, present a good deal of variation with respect to augments, but not--it appears--for γαμεω; see BDF, §§66-67; Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, pp. 168-70; Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, pp. 120-22; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1396-99.

Thus, here both the Hellenistic form and the incorrect augment are results of the influence of the context.

J. Neville Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism and the Oldest Manuscripts: A Comparative Study of the Bodmer and Chester Beatty Papyri of the Gospel of Luke," *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), p. 45, comments:

> "At 14:20 the reconstructed η̣γαμη̣κ̣α̣ of P^{45} is, if correct, probably not a perfect but a variant aorist form: the ἔγημα of P^{75} is an aorist form of the Attic dialect, and is never found in the New Testament without variation. If we were sure of the reading of P^{45} it might be preferable (the usual variant is ἐγάμησα)."

Furthermore, Kilpatrick, "The Aorist of γαμεῖν in the New Testament," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 18 (1967), pp. 139-40, argues that D is correct here with ελαβον, and says (p. 140) of P^{45}'s reading: "Only the first three letters of the word can be discerned at all and they should perhaps be read ηγα[μηκα]. ελα[βον] and εγη[μα] both seem excluded."

[89] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 114. Von Soden gives many examples of such harmonization in *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1430-38 (§325) and pp. 1906-8 (§472),

explains (p. 1430): "Nun giebt es aber endlich, namentlich bei häufig wiederkehrenden Redewendungen, aber auch sonst, Stellen, bei denen die Parallelen in einer Weise mit einander konkurrierten, dass die durcheinandergehenden Fäden zu entwirren besonders schwierig ist."

[90] From P^{45} Colwell ("Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 114) cites only Lk 9:36a, which is in fact supported by 1241. Von Soden, by the way, notes in his apparatus that he thinks that the addition of εγενετο in 1241 is a harmonization to the εγενετο beginning vs. 37.

[91] Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 41, tries to explain this reading in P^{45} as follows: "I suggest that this may be rejected as a 'lection banale', one market place to a town." This could be so, but the fact is that the singular does occur in Lk 7:32 and elsewhere, and so we need not postulate such reasoning by the scribe.

[92] I note that at Jn 11:47 69 alone has replaced φαρισαιοι by πρεσβυτεροι, doubtless for the same reason as P^{45} makes the replacement at 11:57.

[93] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 114.

[94] This same point seems to lie behind Metzger's argument against the authenticity of του θεου at Mt 21:12 (Commentary, p. 54):

> "The fact that the parallel passages (Mk 11.15 and Lk 19.45; cf. Jn 2.14) lack τοῦ θεοῦ would not be an occasion for copyists, if they observed the fact, to delete the words from copies of Matthew, but rather for inserting the words in copies of the other gospels."

[95] Kilpatrick, "The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," pp. 42-43, says of the early papyri: "they enable us to see clearly what is happening during that century [the second century]. Their variations are principally linguistic or stylistic. This is in keeping with the character of the second century, which was a century very conscious of style. It was the century when a new literary movement reached its full influence, the movement of Atticism." However, I believe that the examination of the singulars of our papyri indicates that Kilpatrick's "principally" is too strong.

[96] P^{75} commits this same error twice: at Lk 14:1 and Jn 1:40. Numerous examples of confusions with the augment are cited in Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, pp. 120-22; Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, pp. 168-70; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1396-99; and BDF, §67 and §69. However, I find no other example of an augment added to a participle.

[97] This could be considered just an orthographic variation, if one understands αὑτόν. On the interchange see BDF, §283, and the discussion of Php 3:21 in Metzger, *Commentary*, pp. 615-16. The replacement of the locution ομολογειν εν αυτω by P^{45} and members of family 13 may just be an attempt to avoid an Aramaism; cf. BDF, §220(2). At the other occurrence of ομολογειν εν αυτω, Mt 10:32, the other readings are: αυτω G, αυτον P^{19} [cf. von Soden, *Text*, Nachträge, p. 900] D L Λ pc it vg (*eum*), omit 349 [von Soden cites 348 (his ε121) for both omission and αυτον]. It is interesting that no Greek manuscript changes εν εμοι earlier in Mt 10:32 = Lk 12:8.

[98] Cf., e.g., Jn 1:3, where P^{66} ℵ* D f^{1} 1071 have ουδεν for the other manuscripts' ουδε εν.

[99] This was perhaps occasioned by the -σθη of the preceding εβαπτισθη. Insertion of σ in the aorist passive occurs in other verbs (cf. BDF, §70[3], and Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §489), and von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1399-1400, cites several confusions involving σ in verbal forms.

[100] See Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, pp. 171-72; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1391-94; and BDF, §§80-81.

[101] Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 48, discusses Lk 13:15a, which would fall under this heading, and claims that the finite verb is found "in all attestation except P^{45}." The agreement, however, with 28 1424 pc removes it from our consideration, although it is perhaps an example of the same tendency.

[102] The move, clearly secondary, to parataxis is interesting since it is a shift to a more Semitic idiom (cf. BDF, §419[5]) as well as to stylistically inferior Greek. Cf. Kilpatrick, *Literary Fashions*, p. 3: "For instance, if we have two readings, one of which consists

of two main verbs joined by καί and the other consists of a participle and a main verb without καί, other things being equal, the reading with hypotaxis appears likely to be a stylistic improvement of the reading with parataxis. It seems, however, to be an improvement that could be made at any time and not, for example, to be an instance of Atticism."

See, however, the response on this point by Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism--Which?" Studies in New Testament Language and Text, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 184-91.

[103] Similarly, the και added at Lk 10:37 makes the previous και intensive.

[104] We earlier included this under harmonizations to context, since the shift to the neuter is also involved; such a shift could indeed have been more straightforwardly expressed if our scribe had written the present passive καθιεμενον.

[105] The use of the future with ου μη in the NT is rare; only Mt 16:22 is certain (cf. BDF, §365[1], and Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 44 and n. 20 [where the reference to BDF, §364, is incorrect]). Birdsall concludes: "This seems to suggest that the aorist would be the form more natural to a Hellenistic writer, and that the future is a purist correction." I believe, though, that harmonization to the following απολυθησεσθε is the simpler hypothesis. Note, moreover, that the preceding κριθητε is not extant in P^{45}; thus, it is possible that Lk 6:37 read ου μη κριθησεσθε.

[106] Here, of course, the confusion may have been caused by the similar sounds; see Gignac, Grammar, pp. 239-42 on the interchange of η and ει.

[107] Cf. BDF, §389.

[108] It is true that BDF, §77, say that "both futures are also Att." However, I believe that Kilpatrick (in "Eclecticism and Atticism," Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses, 53 [1977], pp. 109-10) demonstrates that the middle form cannot be said to be Attic.

J. A. L. Lee, "The Future of ζῆν in Late Greek," Novum Testamentum, 22 (1980), pp. 289-98, after an analysis of the evidence, concludes (p. 298): "The usage of the first century A.D. was unsettled." Lee's own evidence, though, confirms that ζησομαι is not Attic (see p. 294).

[109] See note 88 above. By the way, there is also the shift from perfect to aorist at Lk 11:21, for which P^{45} has the support of 1241. Birdsall notes ("Rational Eclecticism," p. 45) that itacism (from ω to o) "has abetted the transformation" here. But he also claims that this reading is an example of the general shift from perfects to aorists: "The perfect was in process of decay in the Hellenistic period and disappearing before the encroachment of the aorist; thus we have an antecedent probability that perfects will be original, aorists corrections, perhaps unconscious." Cf. also BDF, §340.

[110] BDF, §133.

[111] Cf. BDF, §133(2).

[112] C. C. Tarelli, "Some Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 39 (1938), p. 255, notes: "John x is notable for the consistency with which the papyrus employs singular verbs with neuter plurals, in which its support from other MSS is extraordinarily inconsistent.

[113] The support at vss. 8, 12, and 14 is:
vs. 8 ηκουσεν cum L 1071
vs. 12 εστιν cum ℵ A B L W X Θ f^1 f^{13} 33 565 1241 al
vs. 16 γενησονται cum $ℵ^c$ B D L W X Θ Ψ f^1 33 565 1071 al.

[114] "Rational Eclecticism," p. 44.

[115] There is also the substitution at Ac 10:39a, perhaps occasioned by a leap; see note 53 above.

[116] As noted by C. C. Tarelli, "Some Further Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 43 (1942), p. 22.

[117] See BDF, §107 and §307(1).

[118] That vs. 15 does in fact involve asyndeton is argued by Edwin A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906), §2125 (and cf. §2001β).

[119] This question is, of course, independent of the issue of what the authentic text here is. Abbott (*ibid*.)

does not include either of these cases as asyndeton, although no conjunction is printed by Tischendorf, von Soden, the United Bible Societies edition, or Nestle-Aland at vs. 22. At vs. 39 ουν is printed in all four editions (but in the last two in brackets), perhaps on the view, mentioned by Brown, John, p. 404, that its omission could be explained as the result of homoeoteleuton.

[120] Cf. BDF, §462(1).

[121] A related case is the miscopying of ει as εν at Lk 11:20, which produces nonsense in context.

[122] This can be used alone; see BDF, §439(3).

[123] "Rational Eclecticism," p. 49.

[124] The article can, of course, serve this function of the possessive; cf. Smyth, Greek Grammar, §1121.

[125] See above, p. 129 (and p. 128 for the 2 possible homoeoteleuta: Lk 9:52; Ac 7:41).

[126] Cf. the comment by Metzger, Commentary, p. xxvii: "Scribes would sometimes . . . (c) Add pronouns, conjunctions, and expletives to make a smoother text."

[127] Literary Fashions, p. 8.

[128] This is Colwell's explanation in "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 119.

[129] Metzger, Commentary, p. 161, claims that the reverse change is "more likely" at Lk 12:31. On a few occasions (e.g., p. 20 ad Mt 7:18) the Commentary refers to the "stylistic improvement" of relieving monotony by a shift to a different word.

[130] The long transposition at Jn 10:34-35 provides a model of this sort of shift involving many words. Also, Tarelli, "Some Linguistic Aspects," p. 257, calls the transposition at Mk 9:7 "a new example of a genitive pronoun so placed as to combine its possessive function with that of an ethical dative." This seems to put too much stress on the order of words (cf. BDF, §473[1]), especially since the transposition may have arisen by homoeoteleuton (see p. 132 above).

[131] "Some Linguistic Aspects," p. 254.

[132] See BDF, §186(2).

[133] Mt 10:34, the apparent source of P^{45}'s επι, has the accusative. The genitive at Lk 12:51 might be understood as giving επι the meaning (BDF, §234[5]): "(5) Metaphorically 'over' of authority, control (Attic)." This would suggest a move to Attic standards, but LSJ, *s.* επι, A.III.1, also cite Herodotus and Plutarch for this use.

[134] "Some Linguistic Aspects," p. 258.

[135] BDF, §59(2), says: "Usually ʽΗ αἰώνιος as customary in Att." This is put differently in Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, *Grammatik*, §59(2): "att. ebenfalls seltener -ία."

[136] LSJ cites Plato, *Tim*. 37D for αιωνια, but Burnet gives only αιωνιος. Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (Durchgesehener Nachdruck der fünften Auflage; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), cites *Tim*. 38B, but there αιωνιας is (according to Burnet) a variant for διαιωνιας. Plato also uses only two endings when he writes μεϑην αιωνιον at *Rep*. 363D.

[137] Cf. BDF, §59(1).

[138] See Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, p. 164. The feminine is read by B at Mk 10:30, by B 1319 at Ac 13:48, by C* 42 at 2 Pe 1:11, and by B at 1 Jn 2:25. The feminine is found at He 9:12 with the only variation being P^{46}'s αιωνια (taken with the preceding αγια), and is also found at 2 Th 2:16 with F G reading -ιον.

[139] These two cases of singular omission of πας make P^{45}'s support of D 209 it for the omission of παντες in Ac 5:37 rather less weighty.

[140] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 119.

[141] See BDF, §116.

[142] Kenyon, *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, p. x, says that βαιϑσαιδαν occurs once in P^{45}. However, βηϑ- occurs at Mk 6:45 and Lk 10:13, while at Mk 8:22 the first vowel is not legible. Perhaps Kenyon was thinking of his incorrect transcription βαιϑανιαν at Mt 21:17 (see note 17 above).

[143] BDF, §56(2), say that the indeclinable form "is very harsh here."

[144] BDF, §39(7), note: "In the LXX the place-name מַתָּנָה and the proper names מַתַּנְיָה and מַתַּנְיָהוּ are represented as Μανθαν- and it would not be easy to decide whether this tendency was Greek or Semitic." These examples give close (but unfortunately not exact) parallels to the readings of P^{45}.

[145] BDF, §39(7), cite P^{45}'s reading at Ac 9:38 and the reading Σαμφιρη for Σαπφιρη at Ac 5:1 (where Σαμφ- is found in א 33 pc; P^{45} is not there extant), and go on to refer to the view of J. A Fitzmyer that "the 'irrational' nasal may represent a phenomenon well-known in Aramaic: the resolution of doubling by the use of *nun*, e.g. *madda'*, 'knowledge', appears as *manda'* (whence *Mandaean*); *yn'l* from the root *'ll*." See also Franz Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961), §21.

BDF continue by giving the references cited in note 144 above.

[146] See Walter C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik* (2., verbesserte Auflage; Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1961), §38. Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 118-19, cites quite a few examples of the insertion of nasals, but no precise parallel to our two readings.

[147] D 104 319 1838 have Σαυλε twice at 22:7; E 319 have Σαυλε twice at 26:14.

[148] Kenyon, *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, p. x, notes: "σαουλ' (regularly)," and BDF, §53(2), say: "Σαουλ' throughout." The apostrophe occurs in P^{45} from time to time after proper names (e.g., [Σιλα]ν' at Ac 15:22). Cf. the remark by Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction*, p. 47: "The English comma, placed above a letter, is used for the apostrophus, which occurs in the very oldest uncials, especially at the end of proper names, . . ."

[149] *The Gospels and Acts, Text*, p. 31: "per errorem." BDF, §53(2), say: "probably inadvertently."

[150] *The Text of the Epistles* (London: The British Academy, 1953), p. 259 n. 3.

[151] Horner cites a few Sahidic manuscripts as reading ⲗⲁⲍⲁⲣⲟⲥ.

[152] See BDF, §56(2). The first few letters of this name occur in P^{45} at Mt 21:17 and 26:6, but the ending is never legible elsewhere.

[153] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 119.

[154] "Rational Eclecticism," p. 48. Birdsall notes that no attested use of οχυρος seems to provide any insight into this reading.

[155] "Omissions, Additions, and Conflations in the Chester Beatty Papyrus," Journal of Theological Studies, 40 (1939), p. 385.

[156] Except for λεγοντες, of course, all the relevant words are available in the immediate context in Luke.

[157] Tarelli ("Omissions, Additions, and Conflations," p. 385) says: "᾿Οχυροὶ looks like a mistake in writing ὄχλοι from dictation." But the scribe could well have been speaking to himself as he copied; cf. Metzger, Text, p. 13.

[158] The interchange of λ and ρ is frequent in the papyri, especially in documents from the Fayum; cf. Gignac, Grammar, pp. 102-7. At Lk 11:36 P^{45} makes exactly the same confusion by writing its singular μελος for μερος.

Gignac, ibid., pp. 310-12, also cites a number of examples of vowel development, especially between two consonants, which he says (p. 311) "occurs more frequently than elsewhere in Greek, probably because of the colloquial nature of the language of the papyri in comparison with the more formal nature of inscriptional and other literary or monumental evidence." Unfortunately, though, no example of the insertion of an υ is given.

[159] Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 47, says that P^{45} "bears witness" to the reading of D with its "careless omission of μη." But the textual support for μη ετοιμασας makes it likely that these words stood in P^{45}'s Vorlage. If some explanation is needed for this one of many omissions

found in P^{45}, perhaps we should postulate a leap based on hearing: και μη ετοιμασας η ποιησας. The interchange of αι and η is attested (cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 247-49), and so such a leap would be conceivable within the P^{75} ℵ B text.

[160] See the discussion of this variant by Metzger, *Commentary*, pp. 412-14. Metzger mentions the possibility that P^{45} has the authentic reading here, but rejects this hypothesis. He does not, however, provide an explanation of the origin of P^{45}'s reading.

[161] Among the scholars who have remarked upon P^{45}'s clear tendency to omit may be cited R. V. G. Tasker, "The Nature of the Text of the Chester-Beatty Papyrus in Acts," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 38 (1937), p. 384: the "list of readings apparently peculiar to the papyrus among extant Greek MSS. . . . brings out quite clearly that the text of P^{45} whatever be its actual classification is a short text."

[162] Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," pp. 50-51, notes: "In tense changes of the verb it is P^{45} which has a number of purist changes (*regimen Atticum* [see Lk 12:52a and Jn 10:14], future passive [see Lk 6:37 and note 105 above]) while the same situation appertains in the use of the pronoun. . . . Stylistic changes are generally in P^{45} rather than in P^{75}."

[163] The fact that a number of these errors of attempted improvement are (apparently) not classifiable as Atticistic would seem to confirm Tarelli's observation ("Some Linguistic Aspects," p. 259):

> "Altogether I think it must be recognized that the new evidence furnished by this venerable MS does not encourage the belief that deliberate 'correction' played any considerable part in producing textual variations. There appears, in fact, to be no important difference in style and language between the earliest MS and the latest. Corrections and improvements and conjectural emendations of apparently corrupt readings are probably not absent from any MS, including the papyrus itself. But the new evidence confirms the impression that in general the frequent variations which suggest such an explanation are just as likely to be due to the hesitation between different grammatical forms and turns of expression which characterized the language throughout the period of manuscript transmission, and which would probably be found to have affected the autographs themselves, if they should ever come to light."

CHAPTER III

THE SCRIBE OF P^{46}

P^{46} is a codex dating from ca. 200,[1] which once contained (at least) nine of the Pauline Epistles in the following unusual order: Ro, He, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Eph, Ga, Php, Col, 1 Th, followed by perhaps some additional epistles.[2] Portions of 86 of the original 104 folios have been preserved, and indeed in most cases quite well preserved, usually with significant loss only of a few lines at the bottom.[3] The papyrus is now divided into 56 folios known as Chester Beatty Papyrus II (found in Dublin), and 30 folios at the University of Michigan, Inv. 6238.[4]

The textual character of P^{46} seems to be basically Alexandrian, but with considerable support for readings found in D F G.[5] P^{46} appears to be closest to Codex Vaticanus among the major uncials, and indeed in the course of the collation it was quite common to find only B cited in Tischendorf as having the reading of P^{46}.[6] The papyrus has also been found to have a close relationship to the text of 1739, a tenth-century manuscript which preserves "a relatively pure form of the Alexandrian type of text."[7] In fact, P^{46} was found to have 5 agreements with 1739 alone,[8] as well as 11 more with 1739 and only a few other manuscripts.[9] Von Soden cites 1739 systematically, but unfortunately is neither complete nor entirely accurate.[10] Nestle-Aland and the United Bible Societies' edition also cite 1739, but of course at only comparatively few places of variation. It is, therefore, fortunate that there is a published collation of 1739 by Lake, de Zwaan, and Enslin, which appears quite reliable.[11] Consequently, having constructed a list of singulars of P^{46} on the basis of Kenyon's plates, we also examined the photographs of B and the collation of 1739 at those readings of 1739 with no support from continuous-text Greek manuscripts in Tischendorf. This check enabled us to delete (by asterisk) 4 of the readings in the following list,[12] and also to correct quite a few citations of 1739 as reported by von Soden. It may be of interest to note that the support from 1739 at He 12:1d is not cited in the collation of 1739, but is reported by Nestle-Aland and the United Bible Societies' edition.[13]

The writing of P^{46} is in a good hand, as Kenyon notes:

> The script of the papyrus is in marked contrast with that of the Chester Beatty papyrus of the Gospels and

> Acts [i.e. P^{45}]. It is far more calligraphic in character, a rather large, free, and flowing hand with some pretensions to style and elegance.[14]

Abbreviations for nomina sacra are frequent, while breathings and punctuation occur occasionally.[15] There are some pauses in sense indicated by the leaving of a slight space, which led Kenyon to say: "They suggest at any rate some perception by the scribe of the sense of what he was writing."[16]

As with P^{45} the only list of singulars of P^{46} appears to be the one obtained from Kenyon's apparatus in his edition by noting the readings for which he cites no support. While this apparatus seems to be the chief source--usually the only source--for later writers' comments on the singular readings of P^{46}, it is far from adequate. Kenyon fails to cite numerous readings which involve only fairly trivial orthographic matters, but also misses quite a few other readings. Even more serious is his occasional misreading of the papyrus itself, and his apparatus makes little use of von Soden's edition. Of course, Kenyon does indicate most of the singulars, and thus our list of singulars was checked against Kenyon's apparatus, and the discrepancies were checked again.[17] The final list of singular readings of P^{46}, accordingly, is as follows.

Romans

5:19 κατεσταθησαν ς pm : [κατε]στησαν P^{46} : κατεσταθημεν 51 69 l^{555} : καθεστηκαμεν 2 823 : καθεστηκασιν 999

6:6 ημας ς rell : om P^{46vid} pr sp

6:13 μηδε ς rell : και P^{46}

(n) 6:14 αμαρτια ς rell : αμαρτι P^{46}

8:17a κληρονομοι (συνκληρονομοι D*) κληρονομοι μεν θεου συνκληρονομοι ς rell (συγκλ- B^{3} pm) : κ̣ληρονομοι $\overline{\vartheta\upsilon}$ (= θεου) συνκληρονομοι P^{46} : κληρονομοι F G

8:17b συνπασχομεν ℵ B* C D F G : συμπασχομεν ς B^{3} pm : πασχομεν P^{46} : συμπασχωμεν A (συν-) P 33 69 1739 pc

8:17c και sec ς rell : om P^{46} vg^{ms} $cop^{sa^{ms}}$

8:23 αλλα και αυτοι ς ℵ A B C K L P pm : αλλα και ημεις αυτοι D F G pc : αλλα P^{46} : αλλα και αυτοι ημεις 441 : αλλα και αυτοι οι 0142 424* 440 460 pc : αλλα και αυτοι ημεις οι 104

8:28 παντα ς rell : παν P^{46}

(o) 8:30a ους ς rell : ου P^{46}

8:30b και ante ους ς rell : και post ου (pro ους) P^{46} : δε post ους 69 pc

8:32a παντων παρεδωκεν (δεδωκεν 1610) αυτον (εαυτον L pc) ς rell : [παρε]δωκεν αυτον παντων P^{46} : παρεδωκεν αυτον 440 483

Romans

8:32b τα παντα ημιν ς D^{c} rell : ημειν τα παντα P^{46} : παντα ημιν D* F G

8:34 χριστος ς rell : αμα δε χ̅ρ̅ς̅ (= χριστος) P^{46} it^{ar,d*} Ir^{lat}

(n) 8:38 ουτε ενεστωτα ς rell : ου ουτε ενεστωτα P^{46}

9:1 μου ς rell : om P^{46}

** 9:2 λυπη μοι ς rell : μ̣ο̣ι̣ [λ]υπη P^{46} 440

9:3a των αδελφων μου ς B^{2} rell : τω̣[ν] αδ̣ελφων P^{46} : om B*

(o) 9:3b συγγενων ς rell : συνγενων P^{46}

9:4 η λατρεια ς rell : λατρεια P^{46}

9:5 το ς rell (et Hipp$^{noet\ 2}$) : ο P^{46} Hipp$^{noet\ 6}$: τα C* : om F G

9:6 οτι ς rell : om P^{46} it syr^{p} Ambst

9:7a ουδ ς rell : ουθ P^{46}

(o) 9:7b αλλ ς rell : αλ P^{46}

(o) 9:11a εκλογην ς rell : εγλ- P^{46}

(n) 9:11b εκλογην ς rell : -ογη P^{46}

(o) 9:12 αλλ ς rell : αλ P^{46}

** 9:16 θελοντος et τρεχοντος ς rell : τρεχοντος et θελοντος P^{46} 1610

9:26a αν κληθησονται F G : εαν κληθησονται P^{46} : ερρηθη (vel -εθη) αυτοις (B pc om) ς pm

Romans

9:26b υμεις ς rell : om P^{46} it syr^{p}
10:8 καρδια σου ς rell : [καρδια] P^{46vid} pr sp
10:14a ου ς rell : ο P^{46} : εις ον 321
10:14b ακουσονται ℵ* D F G K P 6 104 424 1739 al :
ακουσωνται P^{46} : ακουσουσιν ς rell :
ακουσωσιν $ℵ^{c}$ A B Ψ 1 33 81 al
10:15 γεγραπται ς rell : γεγραπται οτι P^{46}
10:16 ησαιας γαρ λεγει ς rell : καθως
γεγραπται εν τω ησαια P^{46}
10:19 υμας pri ς rell : om P^{46} : αυτους $ℵ^{c}$
C 1610
(o) 11:5 εκλογην ς rell : εγλογην P^{46} : εκλογης D*
11:6a χαριτι ς rell : χαρις P^{46}
** 11:6b ουκετι pri ς rell : ουκ P^{46} 614 1881 pc
it^{d} vg^{st} syr^{p}
** 11:7a ουκ ς rell : ο ουκ P^{46} Ψ
(o) 11:7b εκλογη ς rell : εγλογη P^{46}
11:13 εθνων ς rell : των εθνων P^{46}
11:16 αγια sec ς rell : om P^{46}
(o) 11:18 αλλ ς D^{c} rell : αλ P^{46} : αλλα ℵ B D*
(n) 11:21 φυσιν ς rell (440 om κατα φυσιν) : φυσει P^{46}
11:22 μεν τους ς rell : τους μεν P^{46}

Romans

11:24 οι ς D^{*,c} rell : om P^{46} : οι εαν D^{b} :
εαν 330 1611 : ου 2

** 11:26 ασεβειας ς rell : ασεβεις P^{46} 440 1874 2138

11:27 η παρ εμου ς rell : παρ εμου η P^{46}

(o) 11:28 εκλογην ς rell : εγλογην P^{46}

11:29 κλησις ς rell : κτισις P^{46} : εκλογη 81

11:36 εξ αυτου και δι αυτου ς rell :
δι αυτου και εξ αυτου P^{46}

12:1a υμας P$^{46c(\text{man } 3)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*}

12:1b τω θεω ς rell : $\overline{\theta\omega}$ (= θεω) P^{46}

** 12:4 γαρ ς rell : om P^{46} 1311

(o) 12:5 καθ εις ς rell : κατ ις P^{46}

(o) 12:6 προφητειαν ς rell : προφητεια P^{46}

(n) 12:7 ειτε sec ς rell : ητοι P^{46}

12:8 σπουδη ο ελεων εν ς rell : om P^{46}

** 12:14 ευλογειτε sec ς rell : om P^{46} Ψ^{c} cop$^{bo^{ms}}$

(o) 12:16a φρονουντες pri P$^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$ ς rell :
φρονουτες P^{46*}

12:16b συναπαγομενοι ς rell (B* -γαμενοι) :
συναγομενοι P^{46}

12:20 γαρ ς rell : δε P^{46}

(o) 13:2 ανθεστηκοτες ς rell : ανθεστηκοντες P^{46}

13:4a το sec ς rell : om P^{46}

Romans

(o) 13:4b εκδικος ς rell : εγδικος P^{46}

13:5 αναγκη υποτασσεσθαι ς rell : υποτασσεσθε
D F G : και υποτασσεσθε P^{46c} : και
υποτασεσθε P^{46*}

13:10 η sec ς rell : om P^{46}

13:13 εν ημερα ς rell : ημερα P^{46}

13:14a ιησουν χριστον post τον κυριον ς rell (323
630 1518 1739 1881 pc om χριστον) :
ι̅η̅ν̅ (= ιησουν) χ̅ρ̅ν̅ (= χριστον) ante τον
κ̅ν̅ (= κυριον) P^{46} $it^{ar,t}$: τον χριστον
ιησουν B

13:14b τον κυριον ς rell (B om κυριον) : τον
κ̅ν̅ (= κυριον) ημων P^{46} $it^{ar,t}$

14:3 εσθιοντα sec ς rell : εσθοντα P^{46}

14:4 στηκει ς rell : η στηκει P^{46}

14:18 τω θεω (χριστω 1827) και δοκιμος ς rell
(B G* δοκιμοις, 131 pon δοκιμοις post
ανθρωποις) : om P^{46vid} pr sp

14:21 κρεα ς rell : κ̣ρει[α] P^{46} : κρεας D^{b}
69 1611 1739

15:5 υμιν ς rell : ημειν P^{46}

15:7 διο ς rell : [δι] ου P^{46vid}

Romans

15:12a του ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 15:12b ο ανιστανομενος ℵ : ο ανισταμενος ς rell : ονιστανομενος P^{46}

15:12c αρχειν ς rell : αρχει P^{46}

(n) 15:13 πασης χαρας και ειρηνης ς pm : πασησιη χαρας και ειρηνης P^{46} : εν (om F G) παση χαρα και ειρηνη B F G

** 15:14 αδελφοι μου post δε ς pm : αδελφοι post δε P^{46} 1739

15:15a αναμιμνησκων (B 1912, υπαναμιμ- 440, επαναμιμ- ς rell) ante υμας ς rell : αναμιμνησκων ante απο μερους P^{46}

15:15b ως ς rell : ουτως P^{46}

15:16a εις pri ς rell : δια P^{46}

15:16b η ς rell : και η P^{46}

15:17a εχω ουν την B C^{vid} D F G 69 81 pc : ην εχω P^{46} : εχω ουν ς rell : εχω μεν ουν 88

** 15:17b ιησου ς rell : om P^{46} 323* pc Ambst

15:18 τι post τολμησω (τολμω ℵ^{c} B) ℵ A B C D F G P 69 81 1739 pc : τι ante τολμησω P^{46} : τι ante ων ς pm

15:19 και pri ς rell : τε και P^{46}

15:20 δε ς rell : om P^{46}

(n) 15:23 εχων pri ς rell : εχειν P^{46c} : εχαι P^{46*}

Romans

15:24 ως αν ℵ A B C$^{\text{vid}}$ D (F) G P 69 81 1739 al :
εως αν P^{46} : ως εαν ς pm

** 15:26 αγιων των εν ιερουσαλημ P$^{46c(\text{man } 3)}$ ς rell :
αγιων εν ιερουσαλημ P^{46*} 1149

** 15:27 εν ς rell : om P^{46} 1149

15:29 οιδα δε ς rell : οιδα τ[ε] P^{46} :
γεινωσκω γαρ F G

15:31a μου P$^{46c(\text{man } 3)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*}

15:31b τοις αγιοις ς rell : δια των αγιων P^{46}

15:33 16:25-27 post 16:23 (vel 16:24) ς P^{61} ℵ B
C D 81 1739 al : 16:25-27 post 16:23 (vel
16:24) et post 14:23 A P 5 33 104 pc :
16:25-27 post 14:23 L Ψ pm : 16:25-27
post 14:23 et post 15:33 (sed om 16:1-24)
1506 : 16:25-27 post 15:33 P^{46} :
16:25-27 om F G 629

(n) 16:26 κατ ς rell : κατε P^{46}

16:2a αυτην ς rell : om P^{46}

** 16:2b αν ς rell : εαν̣ P^{46} 1852

16:2c και εμου και αλλων πολλων προστατις εγενετο
D^{b,c} : [και εμου] και αλλων πολλων εγεν[ετο
προστατις] P$^{46\text{vid}}$: και εμου και (cont.)

Romans

16:2c αλλων προστατις (παραστατεις F G) εγενετο D* F G : προστατις (vel -της) πολλων εγενηθη και εμου (A add τε) αυτου A B C L P al : προστατις (vel -της) πολλων εγενηθη και αυτου (ℵ pc add και) εμου ς pm

** 16:7a ιουνιαν ς rell : ιουλιαν P^{46} 6 it^{ar,c,gig,x,z} vg^{am,lugd} 1569 cop^{bo} eth Ambst

16:7b οι (ℵ^{c}, ℵ* om) και προ εμου γεγοναν ℵ A B 630 1739 1881 pc : ος και προ εμου γεγονεν P^{46} : οι και (om 356) προ εμου γεγονασιν (om 2 356) ς pm : τοις προ εμου D F G

(o) 16:12 κοπιωσας ς rell : [κ]ο̣πιουσας P^{46} : κοπιασας C 1319

(o) 16:13 εκλεκτον ς rell : εγ[λεκτον] P^{46}

16:14 ερμην πατροβαν ερμαν ℵ A B C D* F G P 69 1739 pc : ερμην ερμαν πατροβαν P^{46} : ερμαν πατροβαν ερμην ς D^{c} pm

16:15a ιουλιαν (ιουνιαν C* F G) νηρεα (νηρεαν A F G pc) ς rell : βηρεα και αουλιαν P^{46}

** 16:15b παντας ς rell : om P^{46} 1108 1611

** 16:17a τα ς rell : om P^{46} 1739

16:17b διδαχην ς rell : διδαχην ποιουντας P^{46}

16:17c λεγοντας η ποιουντας D F G : η λεγοντας η ποιουντας P^{46} : ποιουντας ς rell : om 1149 1872

Romans

** 16:17d και sec ς rell : om P^{46} 917 1175 pc Spec
16:19 θελω δε ς rell : και θελω D* F G : και θελω δε P^{46} : θελω 103 1827
(16:25-27: vide 15:33)

Hebrews

1:2 και ς rell : om P^{46} cop$^{\text{sa}^{\text{mss}},\text{bo}}$
1:3 δι εαυτου 0121b 6 424** 1739 1881* : δι αυτου P^{46} : αυτου ℵ A B D^{b} H* P Ψ 33 81 al : αυτου δι εαυτου ς D^{c} H^{c} pm : αυτου δι αυτου D* 263 256 365
1:6 εισαγαγη ς rell : [αγαγ]η̣ P$^{46\text{vid}}$ pr sp : προσαγαγη 1898
2:8a τα παντα pri ς rell : om P^{46}
2:8b αφηκεν αυτω ς rell : αυτω αφηκεν P^{46}
2:8c τα sec ς rell : om P^{46}
(o) 2:18 πεπονθεν ς rell : πεποθε̄ (= πεποθεν) P^{46}
3:3 εχει του οικου ς rell : [του οικου] εχει P$^{46\text{vid}}$
3:6 εσμεν P$^{46\text{c(man 3)}}$ ς rell : μεν P^{46*}
3:18 απειθησασιν ς rell : απιστησασιν P^{46} it$^{\text{pt}}$ vg
4:6 εις ς rell (1518 om εις αυτην) : om P^{46}
4:7a ημεραν ς rell : om P^{46} : καιρον Ψ
4:7b σημερον sec ς rell : om P^{46}

Hebrews

**	4:11	απειθειας ς pm : απιστιας P^{46} 104 1611 2005 it^{pt} vg syr^{h}
**	5:1a	τα ς rell : om P^{46} 547
	5:1b	υπερ sec ς rell : περι P^{46}
(o)	5:3	προσφερειν ς rell : προσφερει P^{46}
(o)	5:5	αλλ ς rell : αλλα P^{46}
(n)	5:6	ιερευς $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : επευξ P^{46*}
	5:10	αρχιερευς ς rell : συ ει αρχιερευς P^{46}
	5:12	τα ς rell : om P^{46}
(n)	6:1	τελειοτητα ς rell : θεμελιοτη̣τα P^{46}
	6:4	τε ς rell : om P^{46} : δε 1836
	6:5	ρημα ς rell : ρηματος P^{46}
(o)	6:6	ανασταυρουντας ς rell : ανασ̅τ̅ρ̅ε̅ς̅ (= ανασταυρουντες) P^{46}
	6:7	ους ς rell : οις P^{46}
	6:9	λαλουμεν ς rell : ελαβομεν P^{46}
	6:11	ενδεικνυσθαι ς rell (ενδιγν- A, ενδειγν- C*) : δεικν̣υσθ̣αι P^{46} : ενδειξάσθαι Ψ : επιδεικνυσθαι 2004
(n)	6:13	καθ ς rell : καθε P^{46}
	7:1a	ο pri ς rell : om P^{46}
	7:1b	σαλημ $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : σαμουηλ P^{46*}
	7:2a	εμερισεν ς rell : αυτω εμερισεν P^{46} syr^{p}

Hebrews

7:2b σαλημ $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : σαμουηλ P^{46*}

** 7:2c ο ς rell : ος P^{46} 81

(o) 7:4 ακροθινιων ς rell : ακροτινιων P^{46} : ακροθηνιων A C^2 L P 1739 al

(o) 7:8 δεκατας ς rell : [δε]καδας P^{46}

(o) 7:9 δεκατας ς rell : δεκαδας P^{46}

** 7:11 γαρ ς rell : om P^{46} 2298

7:12 μεταθεσις γινεται ς rell : μεταθεσιν γεινεσθαι P^{46}

7:13 μετεσχηκεν ς rell : μετεσχεν P^{46}

(o) 7:14 εξ ς rell : εκ P^{46}

(n) 7:15 ανισταται ς rell : ανιστασθαι· P^{46}

7:16 ος ς rell : om P^{46}

** 7:18 μεν ς rell : om P^{46} 1241 cop^{sa}

7:19 ουδεν ς rell : ου P^{46}

7:20 εισιν ιερεις post ορκωμοσιας sec ς rell (οι μεν - ορκωμοσιας om D* Ψ 547 pc) : εισιν ιερεις post ορκωμοσιας pri P^{46}

7:21 δε ς rell : om P^{46}

7:25a και $P^{46c(man\ 3)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*}

(o) 7:25b σωζειν ς rell : σωζει P^{46}

7:27a θυσιας ς rell : θυσιαν D P 81 630 pc : om P^{46} l^{112} it^f vg^{ms}

Hebrews

7:27b εφαπαξ ς rell : απαξ̣ P^{46}

8:2a και pri ς rell : γαρ και P^{46}

8:2b ο ς rell : om P^{46}

8:5a μωυσης (vel μωσης ς A D 69 1739 al) ς rell : μωυση P^{46}

(n) 8:5b γαρ $P^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$ ς rell : γρα P^{46*}

8:5c ποιησεις vel ποιησης ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 8:6 διαφορωτερας ς rell : διαφωρωτερας P^{46} : διαφοροτερας L P

8:8 λεγει [ιδου ημεραι ερχονται λεγει] P^{46c} (man 2 [in mg inf]) ς rell : λεγει P^{46*}

8:9a ου ς rell : και ου P^{46}

** 8:9b εν sec ς rell : om P^{46} 2 920 1739 1912

8:11a διδαξωσιν ς rell : διδαξη P^{46} : διδαξουσιν D^{c} 1518 (?)

8:11b εκαστος pri ς rell : ετερος P^{46}

8:12 οτι ιλεως εσομαι ταις αδικιαις αυτων ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 8:13 εγγυς ς rell : ενγυς P^{46}

9:3a η ς rell : om P^{46}

Hebrews

(n) 9:3b αγια ς ℵ* D* rell : ανα P^{46} (Kenyon: "per errorem pro αγια cum Orig [Or^{lat}: sanctum]) : τα αγια ℵ^{c} B D^{c} K L 1241 al

9:3c αγιων ς ℵ* D* rell : των αγιων ℵ^{c} B D^{c} K L P 1241 1739 1908 al : om P^{46}

(n) 9:5a κατασκιαζοντα $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : κατασκευαζον P^{46*} : κατασκιαζον A P 33 pc (pc -ζων)

9:5b περι ς rell : και περι P^{46}

(o) 9:6 εισιασιν $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : ισασιν P^{46*} : ε̣ισιεσαν 88

9:11 γενομενων B D* 1611 1739 2005 : γεναμενων P^{46} : μελλοντων ς D^{c} rell

9:12a του ς rell : om P^{46}

9:12b αιωνιαν ς rell : αιωνια P^{46} it^{d} Dion

9:14 $\overline{\vartheta\omega}$ (= ϑεω) [καϑαριει την συνειδησιν υμων (vel ημων) απο νεκρων εργων εις το λατρευειν ϑεω ζωντι] (vel similia verba) $P^{46c(man\ 2}$ [in mg inf]) ς rell (D* τω ϑεω τω pro ϑεω sec) : $\overline{\vartheta\omega}$ (= ϑεω) τω ζωντι P^{46*}

9:15a τουτο ς rell : τουτου P^{46}

9:15b αιωνιου κληρονομιας (ζωης 623) ς rell : κληρονομιας αι̣[ω]ν̣ιου P^{46}

Hebrews

9:18 ουδ ς rell:; ουϑ P^{46} : ουδε A C $D^{b,c}$ L Ψ 33 pm : ουδεν D*

9:19 τε ς rell : δε P^{46}

** 9:20 ο ϑ̅ς̅ (= ϑεος) $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*} 1319

9:21 δε ς rell : τε P^{46} : om 2

9:22a αιματι $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : νεκ̣ρ̣ω P^{46*}

9:22b αιματεκχυσιας ς rell : αιματος εκχυσιας P^{46}

9:25a εαυτον ς rell : αυτος P^{46} : αὑτον 917 1836

(o) 9:25b κατ ς rell : καϑ P^{46}

10:1a ουκ αυτην ς rell : και P^{46} : ουκ αυτων 1908 : ου κατα 69

(o) 10:1b κατ ς rell : καϑ P^{46}

(o) 10:3 κατ ς rell : καϑ P^{46}

(n) 10:10 προσφορας $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : προς (et spatium ante του) P^{46*}

(o) 10:12 διηνεκες ς rell : διηνεγκες P^{46}

10:14 αγιαζομενους ς rell : ανασωζομενους P^{46}

(o) 10:22 αληθεινης $P^{46c(man\ 3)}$ ς rell : αληθειας P^{46*}

(n) 10:24 εις παροξυσμον ς rell : εκ παροξυσμου P^{46}

10:25a επισυναγωγην P^{46*} ς rell : συναγωγην P^{46c}

(n) 10:25b καθως $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*}

(n) 10:25c τισιν $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : τι P^{46*}

Hebrews

10:26a γαρ ς rell : om P^{46} vg^{ms}

10:26b απολειπεται ς D^{c} (περιλ- D*) rell :
καταλειπεται P^{46}

10:29 αξιωθησεται ς rell : καταξιωθησεται P^{46}

** 10:34a δεσμοις μου ς pm : δεσμοις P^{46} Ψ 104 pc

** 10:34b προσεδεξασθε $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell :
προσδεξασθε P^{46*} 69 440

10:35 υμων ς rell : ημων P^{46}

(o) 10:36 υπομονης $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : υπομονην
P^{46*}

(o) 10:38 και εαν $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : καν P^{46*}

10:39 υποστολης ς rell : om P^{46}

11:1a δε ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 11:3 κατηρτισθαι ς rell : κατηρτισται P^{46}

11:14 τοιαυτα ς rell : τα τοιαυτα P^{46} :
τα αυτα 242

(o) 11:15a μνημονευουσιν ℵ* D* (vid -ουσαν) Ψ 81
1739* 1881 pc : μνημονεουσιν P^{46} :
εμνημονευον ς ℵ^{c} D^{c} 1739^{c} rell (-νευσαν
33 104 pc)

11:15b ειχον D* : ειχαν P^{46} : ειχον αν ς rell

11:16 θεος sec ς rell (D* P 103 pon post αυτων) :
om P^{46}

11:17 τον pri ς rell : om P^{46}

Hebrews

11:21 ιωσηφ $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : αυτου P^{46*}
11:22 περι pri ς rell : και περι P^{46}
11:23a τριμηνον ς rell : τριμηνος P^{46}
** 11:23b και ς rell : om P^{46} 642
11:30 κυκλωθεντα ς rell : κυκλοθεν P^{46}
11:31 απειθησασιν ς rell : απιστησασιν P^{46}
11:32a βαρακ ς rell : βαραχ P^{46} (βαραχθαι pro βαρακ τε Euthalius^{ms})
11:32b τε post δαυειδ ς rell : om P^{46}
11:33 κατηγωνισαντο βασιλειας ς rell : βασιλεις P^{46}
11:35 απολυτρωσιν $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : απολυσιν P^{46*}
11:36 φυλακης ς rell : φυλακαις P^{46}
** 11:39 ουτοι ς rell : om P^{46} 1739 1881 cop^{sa} Cl
** 11:40a προβλεψαμενου ς rell : προσβλεψα- P^{46} 365 1241^{supp}
11:40b προβλεψαμενου ς rell (προσβλ- 365 1241^{supp}) : -μενοι P^{46}
12:1a τοιγαρουν ς rell : τοιγαρ P^{46}
(o) 12:1b περικειμενον ς rell : περιχειμενον P^{46}
(o) 12:1c ογκον ς rell (ονκον D*) : ογκων P^{46}

Hebrews

**	12:1d	ευπεριστατον ς rell : ευπερισπαστ̣[ον] P^{46} 1739
(o)	12:1e	τον ς rell : το P^{46}
(o)	12:3	εκλελυμενοι P^{13} D^{*,c} 1739 1881 pc: εγλελυμενοι P^{46} : εκλυομενοι ς rell
(n)	12:4a	αντικατεστητε ς L** rell : αντικατεστηκεν P^{46c} : αντικατεστη̣σεν P^{46*} : αντεκατεστητε L* 33 69 81 al : αντεστητε K 38 337
**	12:4b	ανταγωνιζομενοι ς rell : αγωνιζομενοι P^{46} P^{13} 69 1245 2005 2495 it^{z}
(o)	12:5a	εκλελησθε ς rell : εγλελησθε P^{46} : εκλελυσθε K Ψ pc
(o)	12:5b	παιδειας (vel παιδιας) ς rell : παιδεια P^{46}
(o)	12:5c	εκλυου ς rell : εγλυου P^{46}
(o)	12:5d	ελεγχομενος ς rell (D ελενχ-) : ελλεγχομενος P^{46}
	12:6-7	κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος) παιδευει [μαστιγοι δε παντα υιον ον παραδεχεται εις παιδειαν υπομενετε ως υιοις υμιν προσφερεται ο θεος τις γαρ υιος ον ου παιδευει] (vel similia verba) P$^{46c\text{(man 2 [in mg inf])}}$ ς rell : κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος) παιδευει P^{46*}

Hebrews

(n) 12:8 ης P$^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell : ο̣ις (vel ε̣ις) P^{46*}

12:9 ειχομεν ς rell : ειχαμεν P^{46}

12:10a γαρ P$^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*}

12:10b αυτοις ς rell : εαυτοις P^{46} : αυτους L

(n) 12:10c μεταλαβειν ς rell : μεταβαλειν P^{46} : μεταλαμβανειν 1739

(o) 12:14a ουδεις P$^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell : ουδει P^{46*}

12:14b τον ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 12:14c κυριον ς rell : $\overline{\text{κς}}$ (= κυριος) P^{46}

(o) 12:15a επισκοπουντες ς rell : επισκοπουντας P^{46}

(n) 12:15b ενοχλη ς rell (-λει K P) : ενχη̣λη (vel ενχι̣λη) P^{46}

12:16a τα πρωτοτοκια ς rell : τας πρωτοτοκειας P^{46} it^{ar,z}

12:16b εαυτου vel αυτου ς rell : om P^{46} arm

12:17a γαρ τοπον ς rell : τοπον γαρ P^{46} : τοπον 88

12:17b καιπερ ς rell : καιτοι P^{46}

** 12:18 και σκοτω ς pm : και σκοτει P^{46} Ψ

12:23 παντων P$^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*}

(n) 12:24 ιησου ς rell : $\overline{\text{ιης}}$ (= ιησους) $\overline{\text{χρς}}$ (= χριστος) P^{46}

Hebrews

(n) 12:25 οι τον et αποστρεφομενοι ς rell : τον et αποστρεφομενον P^{46}

12:26 ου η ς rell : η P^{46c} : ει η P^{46*} : ου 0121b 1739 pc

12:28 λατρευωμεν ς A C D L 048 33 al : λατρευομεν ℵ K P Ψ 0121b rell : λατρευσωμεν P^{46} cop^{bo}

** 13:5 ουδ ου ς rell : ουδε P^{46} 69

13:7a υμων ς rell : om P^{46}

13:7b ων ς rell : ως P^{46}

(o) 13:7c εκβασιν ς rell : εγβασιν P^{46}

13:11 γαρ ς rell : om P^{46}

13:15 θυσιαν ς rell : θυσιας P^{46}

13:16 δε ς rell (δ D*) : τε P^{46}

(o) 13:17 αποδωσοντες ς rell (-σονται D*) : αποδωσοντας P^{46}

13:21a αγαθω ℵ D* Ψ : τω αγαθω P^{46} : εργω (A add και λογω) αγαθω ς D^{c} rell

(o) 13:21b αυτου αυτω ℵ* A C* 33* 81 1241^{supp} 1739^{mg} pc : αυτου αυτο P^{46} : αυτου (pri) ς ℵ^{c} C^{c} 33^{c} 1739* rell : αυτου αυτος 451 2492 pc

13:24a παντας pri ς rell : om P^{46}

Hebrews

13:24b και παντας τους αγιους $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell (88 om παντας, 623 τους φιλους ημων pro παντας) : om P^{46*}

(n) 13:25 υμων $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell (D* των αγιων, 1241 ημων) : υ $P^{46*(?)}$

1 Corinthians

1:8 εως τελους ς rell : αχρι τελους D F G : τελειους P^{46}

1:13 μη παυλος ς rell : η παυλος P^{46}

1:18 μεν ς rell : om P^{46} $it^{b(89),d*,r^3}$ Ir^{lat} Cyp

** 1:21 θεου ς rell : κοσμου P^{46} 623

1:22 και ελληνες ς rell : οι δ̣ε̣ ε̣λ̣ληνες P^{46}

1:24 χριστον et δυναμιν et σοφιαν ς rell : χ̅ρ̅ς̅ (= χριστος) et δυναμις et σοφια P^{46} Cl

** 1:25 εστιν και το ασθενες του θεου ισχυροτερον των ανθρωπων (vel similia verba) ς rell : om P^{46} Ψ 257

1:28 τα οντα καταργηση ς rell (P 102 462 -γησει) : καταργ̣ηση τα οντα P^{46}

2:1 λογου ς rell : λογω̣̄ (= λογων) P^{46}

(n) 2:3 πολλω ς rell : εν πολλω P^{46}

1 Corinthians

	2:8a	εγνωκεν ς rell : εγνωσεν F G : εγνω P^{46} : εγνωσαν 35
	2:8b	δοξης ς rell : δοξη̣ς̣ α̣υτω̄ (= αυτων) P^{46}
(n)	2:14	πνευματικως ς rell : $\overline{\text{πνς}}$ (= πνευματος) P^{46}
	2:15	πνευματικος ς rell : $\overline{\text{πνς}}$ (= πνευματος) P^{46}
(n)	3:1	πνευματικοις ς rell : $\overline{\text{πνς}}$ (= πνευματος) P^{46}
(o)	3:7	αλλ ς rell (αλλα D* 81 1912) : αλ P^{46}
**	4:3	εις ς rell : om P^{46} 177
**	4:15	γαρ ς rell : om P^{46} 1 it^{g}
(n)	4:21	πνευματι ς rell : $\overline{\text{πνς}}$ (= πνευματος) P^{46} : πνευμα D* it^{d}
	5:1a	ακουεται ς rell : ακουω P^{46}
	5:1b	γυναικα ς rell : την γυναικα P^{46}
(o)	5:8	αλλ ς rell (αλλα 33) : αλ P^{46}
	5:12a	ουχι ς rell : om P^{46} syr^{p}
	5:12b	εσω ς rell : εσωθεν P^{46}
	5:12c	κρινετε ς ℵ^{a} rell : κρεινατε P^{46} : κρινειτε ℵ* 255
	5:13a	εξω ς rell : εξωθεν P^{46} Or^{pt} Chr^{pt}
**	5:13b	εξαρειτε ς pm : εξαιρετε P^{46} 6 1739 1881 pc
	6:10	ουτε μεθυσοι ς rell : ουδε μεθυσοι P^{46} : ου μεθυσοι ℵ A C P Ψ 33 81 424** 1739 al

1 Corinthians

	6:12	αλλ ου παντα συμφερει παντα μοι (om C*) εξεστιν ς rell : om P^{46}
(o)	7:4	αλλ pri ς rell (F om αλλ o) : αλ P^{46} : αλλα ℵ A B C 81 pc
**	7:10	χωρισθηναι ς pm : χωριζεσθω P^{46} 614 pc
	7:12	συνευδοκει ς rell : συνευδοκια P^{46}
	7:17	μεμερικεν ℵ* B 81 1739 pc : εμερικεν $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$: εμερισεν P^{46*} ς ℵ^{c} rell
	7:22	ο sec ς rell : om P^{46}
	7:30	και tert ς rell : om P^{46}
(o)	7:36	η ς rell : ην P^{46}
	7:38	την παρθενον εαυτου B D : την παρθενον αυτου P^{46} Cl : την εαυτου παρθενον P^{15vid} ℵ A P 33 81 104 1739 pc : om ς rell
	7:40	μακαριωτερα ς rell : μακαρια P^{46} Cl
	8:1	η pri ς rell : η δε P^{46} it^{ar} vg^{mss}
	8:2	τι ς rell : om P^{46} Ambst
	8:3	τον θεον ς rell : om P^{46} Cl
	8:5	εισιν θεοι πολλοι ς rell : πολλοι εισιν θεοι P^{46} : εισιν πολλοι θεοι 378
	8:6	ο πατηρ ς rell : και ο $\overline{\pi\rho}$ (= πατηρ) P^{46} (και πατηρ Bas)
**	8:7	ασθενης ουσα ς rell : ασθενουσα P^{46} 629*

1 Corinthians

8:9a δε ς rell : om P^{46}

8:9b η $P^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*}

8:9c υμων ς rell : ημων P pc : om P^{46}

8:10 ουχι ς rell : ουχ P^{46}

8:12 ασθενουσαν ς rell : om P^{46} Cl

9:7 της ποιμνης ς rell : αυτης D* F G 3
255 325 : αυτου 1831 : om P^{46} l^{60}
cop^{fay} Ad

(o) 9:8a κατα ς rell : κατ P^{46}

** 9:8b ταυτα ς rell : om P^{46} 1831

9:9 εν γαρ τω μωυσεως (vel μωσεως) νομω (νομω
μω. 255 pc) γεγραπται ς rell : εν γαρ τω
νομω γεγραπται P^{46} $it^{b(89)}$ Ambst :
γεγραπται γαρ D* F G

(o) 9:10a ελπιδι pri ς rell : ελπιζει P^{46}

(o) 9:10b ελπιδι sec ℵ* A B C P 33 81 1739 pc :
ελπιζει P^{46} : aliter ς rell $ℵ^{c}$

9:15a μαλλον ς rell : η μαλλον P^{46} : om 33

9:15b μαλλον ante αποθανειν ς rell : μαλλον
ante η το P^{46} : μαλλον om 33

9:16 γαρ pri ς rell : om P^{46}

9:20 και εγενομην τοις ιουδαιοις ως ιουδαιος
ινα ιουδαιους κερδησω (vel similia verba)
ς rell : om P^{46}

1 Corinthians

9:25 εγκρατευεται ς rell (ενκρα- D* F G) : ενκρατευσηται P^{46}

10:2 μωυσην (vel μωσην ς ℵ A D Ψ 1739 al) ς rell : μωυσεα P^{46}

10:4 επινον ς rell : επειον P^{46}

(o) 10:6a κακεινοι ς rell : και εκει- P^{46} Mcion : και κεινοι F G : εκεινοι 440

(o) 10:6b κακεινοι ς rell (και εκεινοι Mcion, και κεινοι F G, εκεινοι 440) ; -νοις P^{46}

(o) 10:9a εξεπειρασαν ℵ C D* F G P 33 69 81 1739 al : εξεπειρασεν P^{46} : επειρασαν ς D^{c} rell

(o) 10:9b απωλλυντο ℵ A (?) B 81 pc : απωλυντο P^{46} : απωλοντο ς rell

(o) 10:13 εκβασιν ς rell : εγβασιν P^{46}

10:16 εστιν sec post του χριστου (vel κυριου D* F G 93) ς rell : εστιν sec post σωματος P^{46} : εστιν sec ante του σωματος A

10:21a ποτηριον pri ς rell : το ποτηριον P^{46}

** 10:21b κυριου pri ς rell : του $\overline{κυ}$ (= κυριου) P^{46} B

10:21c ποτηριον sec ς rell : το ποτηριον P^{46}

(o) 10:21d τραπεζης pri $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : τρπεζης P^{46*}

1 Corinthians

10:27 εσθιετε ς rell : φαγεσθε P^{46}

10:28 δι εκεινον τον μηνυσαντα και (add δια D 1912) την συνειδησιν ς rell : δι εκεινον P^{46} : δια την συνειδησιν F G

(o) 10:29 η ελευθερια ς rell : ηλευθε[ρια] P^{46}

11:7 δοξα pri ς rell : δοξαν P^{46}

11:9 ανδρα ς rell : ανθρωπον P^{46}

11:14 η φυσις αυτη ℵ A B C D^{*,c} H P 33 69 81 1739 al : η φυσις αυτης P^{46} : αυτη η φυσις ς D^{b} rell : η φυσις F G

11:22 υμας ς rell : om P^{46}

** 11:23 ο κυριος ς rell : κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος) P^{46} 81 330 506 917 pc

11:24a μου εστιν ς rell : εστ̣ιν μου P^{46} it^{pt} vg

11:24b το υπερ ς rell : υπερ P^{46}

11:26 πινητε ς rell : om P^{46}

11:33 εκδεχεσθε ς rell : εκδεχησθε P^{46}

11:34a αν ς rell : εαν P^{46}

(o) 11:34b διαταξομαι ς rell : διατοξομαι P^{46} : διαταξωμαι A D F G Ψ 69 pc : διδαξομαι 1912

12:8 δια του πνευματος διδοται ς rell : διδοται δια του π̅ν̅ς̅ (= πνευματος) P^{46}

1 Corinthians

12:9 ενι A B 33 81 424** 1739 pc : αυτω (sec) ς rell : om P^{46}

12:10 αλλω quar ς rell : ετερω P^{46}

12:12 και μελη εχει πολλα ς D^{c} rell : και μελη πολλα εχει ℵ A B C P 33 69 1739 pc : κ̣α̣[ι] πολλα μελη εχει P^{46} : μελη δε εχει πολλα D* F G

12:16a το ους ς rell : ο πους P^{46}

12:16b τουτο ς rell : τουτο οτι P^{46}

(o) 12:21 ειπειν ς rell : ειπεν P^{46}

(n) 12:26 ειτε pri ς rell : ει τι B F G Ψ 1175 1739 pc : ετι P^{46} : ει 104

13:3 και εαν sec ς rell (και αν B, καν A C 1739) : και P^{46} Bas Chr Cyr

13:4 η αγαπη ου περπερευεται ς rell : ου περπερπευεται η αγαπη P^{46} : ου περπερευεται B 33 104 pc

13:5 ασχημονει ς rell : ευσχημονει P^{46} : αυσχημονει 1241^{supp}

13:12a γαρ αρτι ς D^{c} rell : γαρ P^{46} : αρτι D* F G P

(o) 13:12b προσωπον sec ς rell : πρωσοπο̄ (= πρωσοπον) P^{46}

1 Corinthians

13:13 πιστις ελπις αγαπη τα τρια ταυτα ς rell : τα τρια ταυτα πιστις ελπις αγαπη P^{46} (syr^{p}) Cl

14:5 παντας ς rell : παντα P^{46} : om 1827

(o) 14:7 τοις (om F G) φθογγοις ς rell : τοις φθγγοις P^{46} : φθογγου B : τοις λογοις 1845

(o) 14:9 εσεσθε ς rell : εισεσθε P^{46}

14:10 γενη $P^{46c(man\ 3)}$ ς rell : om P^{46*}

14:11 ουν ς rell : om P^{46}

14:13 διο ο ℵ* A B D^{supp} F G P 048 0243 33 81 467 1241^{supp} 1739 pc : διο P^{46} : διοπερ ο ς ℵ^{c} rell

(o) 14:17 αλλ ς rell (αλλα B 483) : αλ P^{46}

14:18a παντων ς rell : υπερ παντων P^{46} : περι παντων 1311

(n) 14:18b λαλω ℵ B D^{supp} F G P Ψ 048 0243 6 33 81 424** 1739 pc : λαλων ς rell : λαλειν P^{46} : om A

14:19a τω νοι ℵ A B D^{supp} F G P Ψ 0243 33 69 81 1241^{supp} 1739 pc : εν τω νοι P^{46} : δια του νοος ς rell

(o) 14:19b κατηχησω ς rell : καθηχησω P^{46}

** 14:19c λογους sec ς rell : om P^{46} 547 1518

1 Corinthians

14:21a εν sec ς rell : εαν P^{46}

14:21b και pri ς rell : om P^{46}

14:21c ουδ (ουδε 1739) ουτως ς rell : ουδ ως P^{46} : ουδεπω F G

** 14:23 δε ς rell : δε και P^{46} 88 462 823 2004

(n) 14:24 ανακρινεται ς rell : ανακρεινατε P^{46}

14:25a καρδιας ς rell : διανοιας P^{46}

14:25b οντως ο (om א* D* F G 1739) θεος εν υμιν εστιν א A B D F G pc : ο (om Ψ 1836) θεος οντως (om 489, παντως 1867) εν υμιν εστιν ς [illegible] rell : οντως εν υμειν εστιν ο $\overline{θς}$ (= θεος) P^{46}

(o) 14:28 η ς rell : ην P^{46} : ει 256 2127

(o) 14:33a αλλ ς rell (αλλα א A B D Ψ 1908 al) : αλ P^{46}

14:33b ταις ς rell : om P^{46vid} pr sp

14:36 εξηλθεν post θεου ς rell:: εξηλθεν post υμων P^{46}

15:9 του ς rell : om P^{46}

15:10a ου κενη εγενηθη (γεγονεν 1108 1611) ς rell : κενη ουκ εγενηθη P^{46} : ουκ εγενηθη κενη 326 : πτωχη ουκ εγενηθη D* : πτωχη ου γεγονεν F G

(o) 15:10b εκοπιασα ς rell : εκοπισα P^{46}

1 Corinthians

(o) 15:10c αλλ ς D^{c} rell (αλλα [sec] ℵ A B D* 33) : αλ P^{46}

15:10d η (om ℵ* B D* F G 0243 0270* 6 1739 pc) : συν εμοι ς rell : η εις εμε P^{46} syr^{hmg} goth (Or^{lat} Hier: quae in me est)

15:12 οτι sec ς rell : om P^{46}

15:17 ετι ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell : ει P^{46} : οτι 69 327 pc : και ετι ℵ* A 81 104

(n) 15:20 κεκοιμημενων ς rell : κεκοιμενων P^{46}

(o) 15:22 ζωοποιηθησονται ς $A^{*\ ipse\ corr}$ rell : ζωηποιηθησονται P^{46} : ζωοποιησονται A*

(n) 15:24 πατρι vel $\overline{πρι}$ ς rell : $\overline{παρ}$ (= πατηρ) P^{46c} : $\overline{παρι}$ (= πατρι) P^{46*} : $\overline{πνι}$ (= πνευματι) F

(o) 15:27 του ς rell : τους P^{46}

15:29 επει ς rell : om P^{46}

** 15:31a αποθνησκω ς pm : αποθνησκων P^{46} 33 917 1912

15:31b εν ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 15:39 πετεινων D* F G pc : πετηνων P^{46} : πτηνων ς rell

15:40 η των επουρανιων δοξα ετερα δε ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 15:41a δοξα pri ς rell : δοξη P^{46}

1 Corinthians

15:41b ηλιου και αλλη ς rell : ηλιου αλλη δε F G 1^{37} : ηλιου αλλη P^{46} it^{f,m,r^3} vg cop^{bo} Or^{lat} Archelaus Ambst (solis, alia)

15:45 αδαμ sec ς rell : om P^{46}

15:47 ο (om 296) κυριος ς $\aleph^{c}$ $D^{b,c}$ 1739^{mg} rell : $\overline{\text{πνκος}}$ (= πνευματικος) P^{46} : om ℵ* B C D* F G 0243 6 33 424** 1739* pc

15:48 οι sec ς rell : om P^{46}

15:49 και sec ς 1739^{c} rell : δη και P^{46} : om 1739*

15:58 αγαπητοι ς rell (216 transpon αγαπητοι et αδελφοι) : αγαπητοι μου P^{46}

16:3 εαν (αν B D* F G pc) δοκιμασητε ς rell : δοκιμαζετε P^{46}

16:5 διερχομαι ς rell : παρερχομαι P^{46}

16:6 δε ς rell : om P^{46} vg^{mss} Ambst : γαρ 088

** 16:7a υμας αρτι ς rell : αρτι υμας P^{46} 489

(o) 16:7b παροδω $P^{46c(man\ 4)}$ ς rell : παρδω P^{46*}

16:12 οταν ς rell : εαν P^{46}

16:15 αχαιας ς rell : ασιας P^{46} $cop^{bo^{ms}}$

16:19 πρισκα ℵ B P 0121a 0243 33 81 226 1175* 1739 pc : πρεισκας P^{46} : πρισκιλλα ς rell

(o) 16:22 φιλει ς rell : φη̣λ̣ε̣ι P^{46vid}

2 Corinthians

1:2 χαρις ς rell : χαρις και P^{46}

1:5a οτι ς rell : om P^{46}

1:5b ημων ς rell : om P^{46}

1:6-7 ων και ημεις πασχομεν και η ελπις ημων
βεβαια υπερ υμων ειδοτες οτι ως κοινωνοι
εστε των παθηματων (vel similia verba)
ς rell : om P^{46}

1:9 μη ς rell : om P^{46}

** 1:10 τηλικουτου θανατου ς rell : τηλικουτων
θανατων P^{46} 81 630 1739^{c} 2005 it^{d} syr^{p,h} goth Ambst

1:11 και ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 1:12 αλλ εν ς rell : αλλα εν P^{46} : αλλα 1912

1:19 ο του θεου γαρ ℵ A B C P 33 69 424 1739 pc :
ο του γαρ $\overline{\text{θυ}}$ (= θεου) P^{46} : ο γαρ του
(om F G) θεου ς rell

1:20 το pri ς rell : om P^{46}

2:3 η ς rell : om P^{46}

** 2:9 ει ς pm : om P^{46} 2495 pc

2:13 με ς rell : om P^{46} (Tischendorf: Griesbach
et Scholz "om per incuriam")

2:14 δε ς rell : om P^{46}

3:1a εαυτους ς rell : αυτους P^{46}

(n) 3:1b η εξ ς rell : εξ P^{46} : η ως εξ 33

2 Corinthians

(o) 3:6 ος ς rell : ως P^{46}

3:7 δυνασθαι ς rell : om P^{46}

(n) 3:11 το pri ς rell : το τ̣ο̣ P^{46vid}

** 3:15 αλλ ς rell : αλλα P^{46} C

3:18a παντες ς rell : om P^{46} vg^{ms} Spec

3:18b κυριου pri ς rell : του $\overline{\text{κυ}}$ (= κυριου) P^{46}

3:18c κατοπτριζομεθα 33 : κατοπτριζομεθα οι
P^{46} : κατοπτριζομενοι ς rell :
αποπτριζομενοι F G

** 4:3 και ς rell : om P^{46} 440 547 999 1311 1898

4:4 του θεου (χριστου 378) ς rell : $\overline{\text{θυ}}$
(= θεου) P^{46}

(n) 4:6 σκοτους ς rell : σκοτοτους P^{46}

4:7 ινα η ς rell : om P^{46}

4:8 αλλ ου ς rell : και μη P^{46}

(o) 4:9 αλλ pri ς rell : αλ P^{46}

** 4:10 ημων ς rell : om P^{46} 440

4:11a ζωη ς rell : ζωη η P^{46}

4:11b του ιησου ς rell : του $\overline{\text{υιυ}}$ (= υιου) P^{46} :
ιησου χριστου D* F G : ιησου D^{c} :
του χριστου C : om 1311

** 4:16 διο ς rell : διο και P^{46} 1739

4:18 δε ς rell : om P^{46}

2 Corinthians

5:1 οικοδομην εκ θεου ς pm : εκ $\overline{\text{θυ}}$ (= θεου) οικοδομην P^{46}

5:6 ενδημουντες εν τω σωματι ς rell (επιδη- D*, επιλη- F G) : εν τω σωματι ενδημουντες P^{46}

5:8a θαρρουμεν ς rell : θαρρωμεν P^{46} : θαρρουντες ℵ 0243 6 33 81 1739 pc

5:8b και ευδοκουμεν ς rell : ευδοκουντες P^{46}

** 5:8c τον ς rell : om P^{46} 206 241 1245

** 5:9 και ς rell : om P^{46} Ψ 1108 1611 1739

** 5:10 δια ς rell : ιδια P^{46} 365 623 it^{pt} vg Cyp

** 5:14-5 αρα οι παντες απεθανον και υπερ παντων απεθανεν (vel similia verba) ς rell : om P^{46} 242 440

5:19 του (om F G) ευαγγελιου τον λογον D* F G : το ευαγγελιον P^{46} : τον λογον ς rell

** 5:20a υπερ χριστου ουν ς pm : υπερ $\overline{\text{χρυ}}$ (= χριστου) P^{46} Ψ $\text{it}^{\text{b(89)}}$ Or

(o) 5:20b παρακαλουντος ς rell : παρακαλουτος P^{46}

6:8 αληθεις ς rell : ιδου αληθεις P^{46}

6:16 καθως ειπεν ς rell : καθως και ειπεν P^{46} : λεγει γαρ D* F G

6:18 υμεις ς rell : om P^{46}

2 Corinthians

7:1a πνευματος ς rell : $\overline{\pi\nu\iota}$ (= πνευματι) P^{46}

(o) 7:1b αγιωσυνην ς rell (-σινην F) : αγιωσυνης P^{46}

7:1c φοβω ς rell : αγαπη P^{46}

7:3 εστε ante εις ς rell : εστε post ọ[τι] P^{46} (etiam א* add εστε post οτι sed ipse* notavit) : εστε om B 1836

7:4 μοι pri ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 7:5a αλλ ς rell : αλ P^{46}

** 7:5b φοβοι ς pm : φοβος P^{46} 1836 syr^{p} Tert

(o) 7:6 αλλ ς rell : αλλα P^{46}

7:7 υπερ εμου ς rell : υπερ ημων P^{46} : om K

(o) 7:8 ωραν ς rell : ωρας P^{46}

(o) 7:9 αλλ ς rell : αλ P^{46}

7:11a υμιν ς rell : ημειν P^{46} cop^{sa} Euthalius^{ms} : om 1872

(o) 7:11b ζηλον ς rell : ζηλος P^{46}

7:15a υμας ς rell : ημας P^{46}

(o) 7:15b ως ς rell : ος P^{46}

(o) 8:1 εκκλησιαις ς rell : εκκλησιας P^{46}

8:2 και ς rell : om P^{46}

8:5a εδωκαν ς rell : εδωκαμεν P^{46} : δεδωκαν 442

2 Corinthians

** 8:5b κυριω ς rell : $\overline{θω}$ (= θεω) P^{46} 547 it$^{ar,f,r^3}$ vg^{ms} Ambst

(o) 8:7a αλλ ς rell : αλ P^{46}

8:7b εν παντι περισσευετε (-ευητε C P) ς rell : περισσευετε εν παντι P^{46}

** 8:14 γενηται pri ς rell : om P^{46} 206 630 1739 pc

8:19a ου μονον δε αλλα και χειροτονηθεις υπο των εκκλησιων ς rell : om P^{46}

8:19b ταυτη τη ς rell : ταυτη P^{46}

8:19-20 προς την αυτου του κυριου δοξαν και προθυμιαν ημων στελλομενοι τουτο μη τις ημας μωμησηται εν τη αδροτητι ταυτη τη διακονουμενη υφ ημων (vel similia verba) ς rell : om P^{46}

8:21 κυριου ς rell : του $\overline{θυ}$ (= θεου) P^{46} it^{pt} vg syr^{p} Ambst : θεου 241 : του κυριου 489 1845

** 8:22 πολυ ς rell : om P^{46vid} pr sp 206

9:1 περισσον ς rell : περισσοτερον P^{46} it^{g}

9:2a οιδα ς rell : οτι οιδα P^{46}

9:2b μακεδοσιν ς rell : εν μακεδοσιν P^{46}

9:2c αχαια ς rell : αχαινα P^{46}

(o) 9:9 πενησιν ς rell : πενεσιν P^{46}

2 Corinthians

9:12 ευχαριστιων ς rell : ευχαριστιαν P^{46} Cyp Ambst

9:13 τη ς rell : om P^{46}

9:14a υμας ς rell : ημας P^{46}

9:14b υμιν ς rell : ημειν P^{46} : υμας 1311

10:2 τη ς rell (917 pc om τη πεποιθησει) : τε P^{46}

(o) 10:3 περιπατουντες ς rell : περιπατουτες P^{46c} : περιπατουτας P^{46*} : περιπατουντας F G

(o) 10:4 καθαιρουντες ς rell (-των D*) : καθαιροντες P^{46}

(o) 10:7a εαυτω ς rell : εαυτων P^{46}

10:7b χριστου sec ς rell : ο χ̅ρ̅ς̅ (= χριστος) P^{46}

10:8 καυχησωμαι ς rell (-σωμα F G, -σωμεθα 33) : καυχησομαι ℵ L P 0209 0243 6 104 1241 al : καυχησωμαι καυχησομαι P^{46}

10:10 μεν ς rell : om P^{46vid} pr sp

10:12a η συνκριναι (vel συγκ-) ς rell : om P^{46}

** 10:12b συνιστανοντων ς pm : συνισταντων P^{46} 794 1739

10:12c μετρουντες και συνκρινοντες (vel συγκ-) ς rell : νεκρουντες P^{46}

10:18 ο κυριος ς rell : κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος) P^{46}

2 Corinthians

	11:1	μου pri ς rell : om P^{46}
	11:6	αλλ εν παντι φανερωσαντες εν πασιν εις υμας (vel similia verba) ς rell : om P^{46}
	11:9	και sec ς rell : om P^{46}
	11:12	των θελοντων (1898 add την) αφορμην ς rell : om P^{46}
	11:16	καν ς rell : και P^{46}
	11:25a	απαξ ελιθασθην ς rell : om P^{46}
(o)	11:25b	εναυαγησα ς rell : εναυγησα P^{46} : εναυγαγησα P : εναβαγησα 642
	11:27	εν ψυχει ς rell : ψυχει P^{46} : εν ψυχω 296 440
	12:5	ου ς rell : ουδεν P^{46} it^{pt} vg : om א*
**	12:6a	θελησω ς rell : θελω P^{46} 5 69 623
	12:6b	καυχησασθαι ς rell : καυχασθαι F G : καυχησομαι P^{46}
	12:6c	εις ς rell : om P^{46}
	12:11a	ηναγκασατε ς rell : αναγκαζετε P^{46}
**	12:11b	υστερησα ς rell : υστερηκα P^{46} 429 1739
**	12:14	τοις γονευσιν θησαυριζειν ς rell : θησαυριζειν τοις γονευσιν P^{46} 630 1739 pc

2 Corinthians

12:19a παλαι ℵ* A B F G 0243 6 33 81 424** 1739
pc : ου παλαι P^{46} : παλιν ς ℵ^{c} rell

12:19b εν χριστω ς rell (χριστου εν θεω 1836) :
om P^{46} it$^{b(89),d}$ Ambst

(n) 13:3 εις (om 88 489*) υμας ουκ ς rell : ουκ
εις υμας ουκ P^{46}

13:4 ζησομεθα ς D^{c} rell : ζησομεν ℵ A B D* 33
1739 al : ζησωμεν F G : ζωμεν̣ P^{46}

13:7 δε pri ς rell : om P^{46}

** 13:10 ταυτα (ταυτ D*) απων ς rell : απων ταυτα
P^{46} 326

13:13 αγιου ς rell : om P^{46}

Ephesians

1:3 ευλογητος ο θεος και πατηρ του κυριου ημων
ιησου χριστου (vel similia verba) ς rell :
om P^{46}

1:5 δια ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 1:6 εχαριτωσεν ς rell : εχαριστωσεν P^{46} :
εχαρισεν 642

1:9 αυτου pri ς rell : om P^{46}

1:15 κυριω ς rell : $\overline{κω}$ (= κυριω) ημων P^{46}

1:17 ιησου χριστου ς rell : $\overline{χρυ}$ (= χριστου)
$\overline{ιηυ}$ (= ιησου) P^{46}

Ephesians

2:1 παραπτωμασιν ς rell (1836 transpon τοις παρ. et τη αμαρτια [pro ταις αμαρτιαις]) : παραπτωμασιν υμων P^{46} arm (arm autem om υμων post αμαρτιαις)

2:2a περιεπατησατε ς rell : επεριεπατησατε P^{46}

2:2b ενεργουντος ς rell : εργουντος P^{46}

2:4 ην ηγαπησεν ς rell : ηλεησεν P^{46} it$^{b(89),d}$ Ir^{lat} Ambst

2:5a τοις παραπτωμασιν ς rell : τοις σωμασιν P^{46} : ταις αμαρτιαις D* : τη αμαρτια F G : εν (om Ψ) τοις παραπτωμασιν και ταις επιθυμιαις (αμαρτιαις Ψ) B Ψ

(o) 2:5b συνεζωοποιησεν ς rell (εζωοπ- 642) : συνεζωποιησεν̣ P^{46}

2:6 εν χριστω ιησου ς rell : εν τω $\overline{\chi\rho\omega}$ (= χριστω) $\overline{\iota\eta\upsilon}$ (= ιησου) P^{46} : om F G

2:7 εν χριστω ($\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ D) ιησου (om D* F G) ς rell : εν τω $\overline{\chi\omega}$ (= χριστω) $\overline{\iota\eta}[\bar{\upsilon}]$ (= ιησου) P^{46}

(o) 2:13 εγγυς ς rell : ενγυς P^{46}

2:15 εν δογμασιν ς rell : om P^{46} vg^{ms}

(n) 2:16 και ς rell : α και P^{46}

(o) 2:17 εγγυς ς rell : ενγυς P^{46}

Ephesians

(o)	2:19	αλλ A C D* F G 33 pc : αλ P^{46} : αλλα ς D^{c} rell (pm om εστε sec)
(o)	3:1	τουτου ς rell : τουτο P^{46}
	3:7	αυτου ς rell : του $\overline{θυ}$ (= θεου) P^{46}
(n)	3:8	ελαχιστοτερω ς rell : ελαχιστερω P^{46} : ελαχιστω F G 76
	3:11	χριστω ς rell (F G om τω χριστω ιησου) : $\overline{κω}$ (= κυριω) P^{46}
	3:13	υμων pri ς rell (38 om υπερ υμων) : ημων P^{46}
	3:18a	καταλαβεσθαι ς rell : καταλαμβανεσθαι P^{46} : καταλαβειν 1836
(n)	3:18b	το ς rell : ο P^{46}
(n)	4:4	εκληθητε ς rell : εκληθη P^{46}
	4:8	δοματα ς rell : δομα P^{46}
(o)	4:9a	οτι ς rell : οντι P^{46} : om 181 623* 1836 1898
	4:9b	τα ς rell : om P^{46}
(o)	4:10	ο αναβας ς rell : οναβας P^{46}
	4:11	εδωκεν ς rell : δεδωκεν P^{46}
	4:15	ο (om ℵ* A B C 6 33 81 424** 1739 pc) χριστος ς rell : του $\overline{χρυ}$ (= χριστου) P^{46}

Ephesians

4:16 κατ (κατα την 33) ενεργειαν ς rell : και ενεργειας P^{46} : om F G

4:25 διο ς rell : om P^{46} $it^{b(89),mon*}$ Lcf Did

(o) 4:28 ινα ς rell : ιν P^{46} : om B

(o) 4:29 αλλ ς D^{c} rell : αλ P^{46} : αλλα B D*

4:30 μη ς rell : om P^{46}

5:2 θυσιαν ς rell : οσμην P^{46}

** 5:4 η ευτραπελια ς rell : και ευτραπελια P^{46} 629 1518 Cyp

5:5 του χριστου και θεου ς rell : του $\overline{\text{θυ}}$ (= θεου) P^{46} Tert : θεου 1245 2147 : του θεου και χριστου F G : του χ. 38* 90 : του χ. του θ. 1739* : χ. και θ. 2005 : του υιου του θεου 1836

5:11a και pri ς rell : om P^{46}

** 5:11b και sec ς rell : om P^{46} 917

(o) 5:11c ελεγχετε ς rell : ελλεγχετε P^{46}

5:12 κρυφη ς rell : κρυβη P^{46}

5:14 των ς rell : om P^{46}

5:15a περιπατειτε ς rell : περιπατητε P^{46}

(o) 5:15b αλλ ς rell : αλλα P^{46}

5:17 κυριου ς rell (B add ημων) : $\overline{\text{χρυ}}$ (= χριστου) P^{46} : θεου A 81 pc

Ephesians

	5:24	ως ℵ A D* F G P 33 424** 1739 pc : οτι P^{46} : ωσπερ ς D^{c} rell : om B Ψ 88
(n)	5:27a	εχουσαν ς rell : εχουσα P^{46}
(o)	5:27b	αλλ ς rell : αλ P^{46}
	5:31	σαρκα ς rell : σαρκαν P^{46}
**	6:8	ποιηση ς rell (P 462 -σει) : ποιη P^{46} Ψ
	6:11	υμας ς rell : om P^{46}
	6:12a	αρχας προς τας εξουσιας ς rell (D και pro προς τας) : μεθοδιας P^{46}
	6:12b	εν τοις επουρανιοις ς rell : om P^{46} Did
(n)	6:13	δυνηθητε ς rell : δυνητε P^{46}
	6:23	αδελφοις ς rell : αγιοις P^{46}

Galatians

	1:4	των ς rell : om P^{46}
(n)	1:11a	το ευαγγελισθεν ς rell (ευηγγ- A) : οθεν P^{46}
(o)	1:11b	κατα ς rell : κατ P^{46}
(o)	1:12	παρα ς rell : παρ P^{46}
	1:14	προεκοπτον ς rell : επροεκοπτον P^{46}
**	1:15	και καλεσας δια της χαριτος αυτου ς pm : om P^{46} 6 1739 1881 pc
	1:17a	ανηλθον ς rell : απηλθον P^{51} B D F G pc : ηλθον P^{46}

Galatians

1:17b απηλθον ς rell : απηλθα P^{46}

1:18 επεμεινα ς rell : εμεινα P^{46} : υπεμεινα P

2:1 βαρναβα ς rell : βαρναβας P^{46}

(o) 2:2 κατ ς rell : καθ P^{46}

2:3 ο (B om) συν (εν 1319) εμοι ς rell : om P^{46}

2:5a τη υποταγη ς rell : om P^{46}

2:5b ευαγγελιου ς rell : θ̅υ̅ (= θεου) P^{46}

2:9 ιακωβος και κηφας ς rell : πετρος και ιακωβος D F G 629 1175 : ιακ̣[ω]βος και πετρος P^{46} it^{r3} : ιακωβος A

2:12a τινας ς rell : τ̣ινα P^{46} $\text{it}^{d,g^{c},r3*}$

2:12b συνησθιεν ς rell : συνησθειον P^{46} vg^{ms}

2:13 συναπηχθη ς pm : απηχθη P^{46}

** 2:14 και ουκ (vel ουχ vel ουχι vel om) ιουδαικως ς pm : om P^{46} 917 1881 $\text{it}^{ar,b(89),d}$ Ambst

2:15 ιουδαιοι ς rell : ιουδαιοι οντες P^{46}

2:17 ευρεθημεν ς rell : ευρεθωμεν P^{46}

(o) 3:2 εργων νομου ς rell : εργων ομου P^{46}

3:4 και ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 3:10a οτι ℵ A B C D F G P Ψ 33 1739 pc : τι P^{46} : om ς rell

Galatians

(o) 3:10b βιβλιω ς rell (τω νομω του βιβλιου Ψ) : βιβλω P^{46}

3:12 δε ς rell : om P^{46}

3:18 εκ ς rell : δια P^{46}

3:19 ετεθη D* F G pc : προσετεθη ς $D^{b,c}$ rell (-θην L) : om P^{46}

(n) 3:21 ζωοποιησαι ς C^2 rell : ζωοποιηθησεται P^{46} : ζωοποιειν C*

** 3:26 εν χριστω ιησου ς pm : $\overline{\text{χρυ}}$ (= χριστου) $\overline{\text{ιηυ}}$ (= ιησου) P^{46} 6 cop^{sa}

(n) 3:27 εβαπτισθητε ς rell : εβα[πτισθ]ημεν P^{46}

3:28a ουκ ενι pri ς rell : ουκετι P^{46}

3:28b ουκ ενι sec ς rell : ο̣υκετι P^{46}

3:28c γαρ ς rell : om P^{46}

4:6 του υιου αυτου ς rell : αυτου P^{46} Mcion : του υιου 489

(n) 4:9 πτωχα στοιχεια ς rell : πτωχια P^{46}

4:10 παρατηρεισθε ς rell : παρατηρουντες P^{46}

** 4:11 κεκοπιακα ς pm : εκοπιασα P^{46c}(man 1) 1739 1881 : εκοπισα P^{46*}

4:14a υμων ℵ* A B C^2 D* F G 33 424** pc : μου P^{46} $it^{ar,x}$: τον $ℵ^c$ 81 104 1241^{supp} pc : μου τον ς C^{*vid} $D^{b,c}$ rell : υμων τον 6 1739 1881 pc

Galatians

4:14b ουδε εξεπτυσατε ς rell : om P^{46}

4:15 εξορυξαντες ς rell : εξ̣[ορυξα]τε P^{46}

4:23 εκ sec ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 4:24 αλληγορουμενα ς rell : αληγορουμενα P^{46}

(o) 4:27 ου ς rell : ουκ P^{46} : μη D F G

(o) 4:29 αλλ ς rell : αλ P^{46} : αλλα B

** 5:6 ενεργουμενη ς rell : ενεργουμενης P^{46} ψ 642

5:9 το ς rell : om P^{46}

5:12 οφελον (vel ωφελον) ς rell : αρα P^{46}

5:14a αγαπησεις ς rell (-σης P) : αγαπησαι P^{46}

5:14b σου ς rell : om P^{46}

(n) 5:16 περιπατειτε ς rell : περιπατεισθε P^{46}

6:2 αναπληρωσετε B F G 322 323 1962 2495 : αποπληρωσετε P^{46} : αναπληρωσατε ς rell

6:3 ει γαρ ς rell : [ει]περ P^{46}

6:4a εαυτον ς rell : αυτον P^{46}

6:4b και ουκ ς rell : [ου]κ̣ P^{46vid} pr sp

(o) 6:6a κατηχουμενος ς rell : καθηχουμε[νος] P^{46}

(o) 6:6b κατηχουντι ς rell (K om τω κατηχουντι) : καθηχουντι P^{46}

6:7 ο ς rell : α P^{46} it^{pt} vg Spec

6:13 ουδε ς rell : ουτε P^{46} : ου 1908 pc

Galatians

6:14 γενοιτο ς rell : γενοιτο με P^{46}

6:16 στοιχησουσιν ς C^{2} rell : στοιχησωσιν P^{46} : στοιχουσιν A C* D F G 1739 1881 pc

Philippians

1:7 συνκοινωνους (vel συγκ-) ς rell : και κοινωνους P^{46}

1:8a μου ς rell : μοι D F G Ψ 104 pc : om P^{46} it^{ar}

(o) 1:8b ως ς rell : ω P^{46}

1:10 ημεραν ς rell : την ημεραν P^{46}

1:11 δοξαν και επαινον μοι F G : δοξαν και επαινον θεου ς D^{c} rell (D* 1962 χριστου pro θεου, 1925 ^{om} θεου) : δοξαν $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ (= θεου) και επαινον εμοι P^{46}

(n) 1:13 φανερους ς rell : [φα]νερουσθαι P^{46}

** 1:15 μεν και ς pm : [με]ν δε P^{46} 1245

1:18a ειτε pri ς rell : ει P^{46}

1:18b και pri ς rell : αλλα και P^{46} cop$^{bo^{ms}}$

(o) 1:20a παρρησια ς rell : παρησια P^{46}

(n) 1:20b ζωης P$^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : ζως P^{46*}

** 1:23 μαλλον ς rell : om P^{46} 436 Cl Or^{lat}

** 1:30 εν εμοι sec ς rell : om P^{46} 81

2:7 ανθρωπων ς rell : ανθρωπου P^{46} vg^{mss} Mcion Cyp

Philippians

(n) 2:18 υμεις (αυτοι 242) χαιρετε και ς rell : υμεις χαιρετε και υμεις χαιρετε και P^{46}

2:22 γινωσκετε ς rell : οιδατε P^{46}

(o) 2:23 τουτον ς rell : τουτο P^{46}

2:24 δε ς rell : om P^{46}

(o) 2:25 αποστολον ς rell : [απο]στολος P^{46}

2:26 παντας υμας ς א^{c} rell (B υμας παντας, 941 pon υμας ante ην) : παντας υμας ιδειν א* A C D I^{vid} 33 81 104 326 365 1175 1241^{supp} 2495 al : π̣ε̣μ̣[ψαι] προς υμας P^{46vid}

3:1 μου ς rell : om P^{46}

3:3 πνευματι θεου א* D^{c} rell : πνευματι θεω ς א^{c} D* P Ψ 365 1175 pc (1984 θειω pro θεω) : εν πνευματι P^{46} vg^{ms}

(o) 3:5a περιτομη ς rell : περιτομης P^{46}

(n) 3:5b νομον ς rell : νοφον P^{46}

3:10 συμμορφιζομενος τω θανατω αυτου (vel similia verba) ς rell : om P^{46}

3:14a του θεου ς rell : $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ (= θεου) P^{46} Ambst : om F G 181

3:14b εν χριστω ιησου ς rell (P^{16} εν ιησου χριστου, 242 om ιησου) : εν κυριω ιησου χριστω D* F G : om P^{46}

Philippians

3:17 καθως ς rell : καθως και P^{46}

3:18 λεγω ς rell : λεγω β[λε]πετε P^{46}

3:20 απεκδεχομεθα ς rell : om P^{46vid} pr sp

4:3a σε ς rell : om P^{46}

4:3b βιβλω ς rell : βυβλω P^{46}

(o) 4:5a επιεικες ς rell : επικες P^{46}

(o) 4:5b εγγυς ς rell : ενγυς P^{46}

(n) 4:6 μετα (μετ א B pc) ευχαριστιας ς rell : μετα ευχαριστειας μετα ευχαριστειας P^{46}

4:7 χριστω ς rell : κ̅ω̅ (= κυριω) P^{46}

4:10 ανεθαλετε ς D^{b} rell (-λλ- P 1 pc) : [ανεθ]α̣λ̣ατ̣ε̣ P^{46} : εθαλατε D* : ενεθαλετε 181 : ανεθαλε 177

4:15 μονοι ς rell : μονον P^{46} : om A* arm

4:17 το δομα αλλα (vel αλλ, 547 add οτι) επιζητω ς rell : om P^{46}

4:18a δεξαμενος ς rell : δε δεξαμενος P^{46} vg^{ms}

(o) 4:18b οσμην ς rell : οσμη P^{46} : εις οσμην 33 296 467

Colossians

(o)	1:7a	συνδουλου $P^{46c(man\ 4)}$ ς rell : συνδολου P^{46*}
(o)	1:7b	ος ς rell : ο P^{46}
**	1:12	ευχαριστουντες ς rell (-ουμεν C^{c} $P^{mg\ eccl}$ pc) : και ευχαρι[στουντ]ες P^{46} 1175 eth Ambst
	1:16	εξουσιαι τα (om 81) ς rell : εξουσιαι οτι P^{46}
(o)	1:20a	αποκαταλλαξαι ς rell (-ξη A) : αποκατααλλαξαι P^{46}
**	1:20b	σταυρου αυτου ς rell : σ̅τ̅ο̅υ̅ (= σταυρου) P^{46} Ψ
	1:22a	αποκατηλλαγητε B : αποκαταλ[λα]γητε P^{46} : αποκατηλλακται 33 αποκατηλλαξεν ς D^{c} rell (P Ψ 81 pc απεκ-) : αποκαταλλαγεντες D* F G : απηλλαξεν 104
**	1:22b	εν ς rell : om P^{46} 1311
	1:23a	και μη ς rell : μη 33 489 : δ̣[ε] P^{46vid}
	1:23b	μετακινουμενοι ς rell : [μετακινη]τοι P^{46} (?)
(o)	1:24	ανταναπληρω ς rell : ανταναπληρων P^{46} : αναπληρω F G pc
	1:27	της δοξης pri ς rell : om P^{46}

Colossians

1:28 καταγγελλομεν ς rell : καταγγελλοντες P^{46}

(n) 2:1 το ς rell : μου το P^{46}

2:13 παντα τα παραπτωματα ς rell : τα π[αρα]πτωματα παντα P^{46}

(o) 2:18 εμβατευων ς D^{c} rell (ενβ- D* F G, ενμβ- 69) : εμβαδευ[ων] P^{46}

(n) 2:23 εν εθελοθρησκια (vel -σκεια) ς rell : ε̣θ̣ε̣λο εν θρησκεια P^{46vid} : εν θρησκια F G

3:1-2 ζητειτε ου ο χριστος εστιν εν δεξια του θεου καθημενος τα ανω (vel similia verba) ς rell : om P^{46}

3:6a δι α ς C^{2} $D^{b,c}$ rell : δι ο C* D* F G : δια ταυτα P^{46} syr^{p}

3:6b ερχεται ς rell : γαρ ερχεται P^{46} syr^{p}

3:9 ψευδεσθε ς rell : ψευδησθε P^{46}

3:16a ενοικειτω ς rell : οικειτω P^{46}

(o) 3:16b πνευματικαις ς rell : πνευματικοις P^{46}

(o) 3:19 αυτας ς rell : αυταις P^{46}

3:24 απο ς rell : απο του P^{46}

(o) 4:9 ος ς rell : ο P^{46}

4:11a εκ ς rell : εκ της P^{46}

** 4:11b μοι ς rell : εμοι P^{46} 1739

1 Thessalonians

1:10 αναμενειν ς rell : υπομε̣[νειν] P^{46}

5:6 νηφωμεν ς rell (-ομεν F P al) : [νη]ψωμεν P^{46}

The total number of singular readings in P^{46} is 668, by far the largest of our six papyri. Of these, 141 are orthographic singulars and 56 are nonsense readings. We are thus left with 471 significant singulars.

Corrections.--Many of the errors committed by the scribe of P^{46} have been corrected by him or by later hands. I have counted a total of 160 corrections in the papyrus, the majority of which appear to be by the scribe himself. The scribe and the later correctors devoted most of their attention to the earlier portion of the codex, and especially to Hebrews, where 76 corrections are made.[18]

The later hands have been characterized by Zuntz, who presents a useful summary of their activities.[19] The corrector whom I have called "man 2" used

> a broad pen and very black ink. This set, I suggest, comes from the hand which also added the page numbers and wrote the number of στίχοι under each epistle; in other words, this is the hand of the *ex officio* corrector who, still in the scriptorium, applied the finishing touches to the work of the scribe.[20]

The corrector here called "man 3"

> writes a cursive hand which is easily distinguished from all others and, as C. H. Roberts tells me, should be dated late in the third century. That is to say, this is the hand of a later user of this manuscript who corrected a few places whose wording struck him as incorrect.[21]

Finally, Zuntz suggests that "some other hand" corrected 1 Cor 16:7, "using pale ink."[22] I have indicated this hand as "man 4," and believe that he may also have made the corrections at 2 Cor 4:2 and Col 1:7.

Besides these later correctors, there are 34 corrections assignable (more or less certainly) to the scribe ("man 1"). In a few cases the scribe clearly caught his error immediately: Ro 9:20 (where the scribe started to write αυτου but stopped after αυ);[23] He 9:22 (where the scribe seems to have leaped back to και pri, written σχεδον, and then found his place);[24] He 13:18 (where the scribe changed his mind about how to divide καλην); 1 Cor 14:9 (where he leaped back to vs. 7 and then found his place);[25] Ga 1:14 (where the scribe first wrote περισσοτερον, but then deleted the -ον and added -ως);[26] and Php 1:23 (where he first wrote εν χ̅ω̅, but then corrected to εχων).[27] Most of the other corrections by the scribe are of mere blunders (e.g., He 9:8b, 11:22, 11:32;[28] Ga 4:22), or even of orthographic matters (e.g., Ro 13:14a; He 8:5; 1 Cor 13:12).

Moreover, there are 68 corrections (noted merely as "P^{46c}") which I believe may be by the original scribe, but could be by a later hand. Most of these involve the deletion of letters by dots or by lines (e.g., Ro 9:4, 13:12; He 7:1).[29] In other cases, a letter or two may be added, but it is unclear whether the scribe is responsible: e.g., Ro 9:17; He 13:8, 13:9;[30] 1 Cor 12:26,[31] 15:17. In the vast majority of cases of this sort, the correction is of what would otherwise be considered an orthographic or nonsense singular. Consequently, our eventual list of significant singulars would remain more or less the same were we to judge that these corrections were indeed by a later hand, and thus to include the original readings in our list. The ascriptions adopted here must of course be tentative, since they are made on the basis of photographs, and so it is fortunate that (as I believe) no material alteration in our eventual results would occur if some of these ascriptions should prove incorrect. However, the general features of the series of corrections are clear even from the plates.[32]

The second hand made, by my count, 44 corrections, 33 of which are in Hebrews. This corrector removed some of the more striking errors of the scribe: He 5:6, 7:1a, 7:2, and 9:22a.[33] Three of the longer omissions by scribal leaps were also corrected by him by means of a sign in the text and a marginal addition: He 8:8,[34] 9:14, and 12:6-7.[35] This hand also made two corrections of the text where the scribe had left the papyrus blank, perhaps because his exemplar was defective: He 10:10a,[36] 13:25.[37]

The third hand made, it seems, 10 corrections, the last of which I have noted at 2 Cor 1:19.

There is one example of a correction in two stages: 1 Cor 6:14. Here the scribe wrote εξεγειρει. Zuntz believes that the second hand changed this to εξεγερει, although the line deleting the first ι may well be by the scribe.[38] Subsequently, the second hand corrected this to εξηγειρεν, the reading of B 6 424** 1739.[39]

Although most of the corrections, whatever their origin, are of obvious slips, some are weightier. Zuntz indeed claims that P^{46} illustrates

> the endeavour to move away from such forms of the text as are attested, in the extant tradition, by Western witnesses (exclusively or with others) and to replace them by 'Alexandrian', and particularly by B-readings.[40]

The evidence for this shift may be seen in the following corrections.

He 5:11: Besides P^{46*} and P, the omission of the article is supported only by the Western witnesses D* 1319.[41]

He 10:1: Zuntz suggests that the omission in P^{46*} likely came from the reading in D* pc, and was corrected to the reading found in ℵ C Ψ 1739 pm.[42]

He 11:12: The omission is also made by D*.[43]

1 Cor 6:14: As discussed above, the eventual reading here is clearly Alexandrian.[44]

1 Cor 7:17: Zuntz follows Kenyon in seeing the singular reading (created by the scribe) as the result of an attempt to write the perfect, which is clearly Alexandrian.[45]

1 Cor 13:5: Zuntz notes that the insertion of μη is found only in B.[46]

2 Cor 1:19: The correction is from the reading in D F G.[47]

2 Cor 6:14: Again the correction is from the reading found in D* F G.[48]

2 Cor 10:3: The correction from the accusative to the nominative is a shift from the reading of F G, although the corrector has not caught the omission of ν.[49]

Eph 4:15: The neuter relative is found in D.[50]

Zuntz cites a few more corrections as evidence for the general direction of correction, but these seem to me to be less clear than the ten mentioned above.[51] In any case, there appear to be no cases at all of correction in the opposite direction. This is a particularly striking result since the direction is based on corrections by the scribe, the second hand, and the third hand, and since P^{46} does have significantly many readings which are found in D F G.[52] Thus, the tendency of correction is definitely toward the Alexandrian text.[53]

Finally, it is interesting to note that in fully 12 cases the correction has resulted in a singular reading. One of these is clearly by the scribe (1 Cor 7:17), and one appears to be by man 4 (2 Cor 4:2). Four others are by the second hand (Ro 9:25; He 10:24; Ga 5:17; Col 3:3), and the remaining six may be by the scribe: Ro 15:23; He 10:25a, 12:4b, 12:26; 1 Cor 15:24; 2 Cor 10:3. There are also a few readings where the correction has only rather weak support: Ro 13:12;[54] He 1:1, 13:6; Ga 4:11. The 10 corrections by the third hand are always to the majority text.

Orthography.--After removal of any readings caused by interchanges of ει/ι, αι/ε, and οι/υ, there remain 141 readings which may be classified as orthographic in origin. It is thus apparent that the scribe was very erratic in his spelling. Indeed, in contrast to P^{45}, where only 3.3% of the singulars are orthographic, in P^{46} 21.1% of the singulars are orthographic. These singulars may be classified as follows.

Simplification and gemination of consonants:[55]

a) -ρ- for -ρρ-: Php 1:20a (παρησια).[56]

b) -λ- for -λλ-:[57]

αλ for αλλ (17 cases):[58] Ro 9:7b, 9:12, 11:18; 1 Cor 3:7, 5:8, 7:4, 14:17, 14:33a, 15:10c; 2 Cor 4:9, 7:5a, 7:9, 8:7a; Eph 2:19, 4:29, 5:27b; Ga 4:29.

other: 1 Cor 10:9b; Ga 4:24.

c) -λλ- for -λ-:[59] He 12:5d; Eph 5:11c.

Elision:[60] ιν (Eph 4:28); κατ (1 Cor 9:8a; Ga 1:11b); παρ (Ga 1:12).

Non-elision:

αλλα for αλλ:[61] He 5:5; 2 Cor 1:12, 7:6; Eph 5:15b.

αποκατααλλαξαι:[62] Col 1:20a.

Aspiration:

καθ ενιαυτον:[63] He 9:25b, 10:1b, 10:3.

καθ ιδιαν:[64] Ga 2:2.

καθηχεω:[65] 1 Cor 14:19b; Ga 6:6a, 6:6b.

Non-aspiration:[66] κατ ις = καθ εις, Ro 12:5.

In this connection may also be noted εκ for εξ at He 7:14,[67] and ουκ for ου at Ga 4:27.[68]

Assimilation: εγ- for εκ- before voiced consonants.[69]

εγβ- for εκβ-:[70] He 13:7c; 1 Cor 10:13.

εγδ- for εκδ-:[71] Ro 13:4b.

εγλ- for εκλ-:[72] Ro 9:11a, 11:5, 11:7b, 11:28, 16:13; He 12:3, 12:5a, 12:5c.

P^{46} exhibits a number of readings arising from mistakes concerning nasal sounds. In many of these cases we may well have also confusions based on grammar. However, because of the frequency in the papyri of confusions involving nasal sounds,[73] these are treated here as orthographic singulars. If, on the other hand, one were to consider the readings which might be alternative forms as non-orthographic singulars, then most of them would be in fact nonsense in context. Consequently, they would in any case be excluded from the category of significant singulars.

Unassimilated ν before γ:[74]

ενγυϲ:[75] He 8:13; Eph 2:13, 2:17; Php 4:5b.

other: Ro 9:3b (συνγενων).[76]

Insertion of medial nasals before stops:[77]

before κ: He 10:12 (-γκ-).

before τ: Ro 13:2; Eph 4:9a.

Addition of final ν before a word beginning with a stop:[78] 2 Cor 10:7a; Col 1:24.

Addition of final ν to η after εαν:[79] 1 Cor 7:36, 14:28.

Omission of medial ν before a stop:[80] Ro 12:16a; He 2:18; 2 Cor 5:20b, 10:3.

Omission of medial ν between vowels:[81] He 10:22.[82]

Omission of final ν before a word beginning with a stop:[83] Ro 9:11b, 11:21, 12:6; He 5:3,[84] 12:1e.

Omission of final ν before a word beginning with a nasal or sibilant:[85] Eph 5:27a;[86] Gal 3:2;[87] Php 2:23.

Omission of final ν before a word beginning with a vowel:[88] He 7:25b; Php 4:18b.

P^{46} also has a number of singular readings which arise from errors involving ς. The omission or addition of final ς is rather frequent in the papyri,[89] and so such errors are treated here as orthographic singulars.

Omission of final ς before a word beginning with a consonant:[90] Ro 8:30a; He 12:5b.

Omission of final ς before a word beginning with a vowel:[91] He 12:14a; Php 1:8b; Col 1:7b, 4:9.

Addition of final ς:[92] 1 Cor 10:6b, 15:27;[93] Php 3:5a.[94]

There is also one case of the insertion of a medial ς,[95] εχαριστωσεν at Eph 1:6, where probably the scribe was influenced by χαρις.

There are a further six readings which result from the interchange of -ς and -ν. Gignac remarks:

> Final -ς and -ν sometimes interchange. Many of the examples may be the result of scribal error or reflect a confusion of cases or verb forms, but since both /n/ and /s/ tended to be dropped in final position, there is a possibility that these instances represent the interchangeability of 'silent' letters.[96]

In fact, all six of the examples found in P^{46} could be the result of confusion of cases,[97] a confusion which P^{46} is frequently guilty of. These six examples could thus be seen as nonsense in context readings.

Final ς replaced by final ν:[98] He 10:36.

Final ν replaced by final ς:[99] He 12:14c; 2 Cor 7:1b,[100] 7:8,[101] 7:11b; Php 2:25.

There remain six cases of confusion of consonants, each of which involves a rather frequent interchange.

δ for τ:[102] He 7:8, 7:9;[103] Col 2:18.[104]

τ for ϑ intervocalically:[105] He 7:4.

τ for ϑ after σ:[106] He 11:3.[107]

χ for ϰ intervocalically:[108] He 12:1b.

P^{46} also contains a large number of singulars arising from the scribe's representation of vowel sounds. The diversity of confusions cited here is striking.

At one reading P^{46} alone has crasis (He 10:38),[109] and at another reading alone avoids crasis (1 Cor 10:6a).[110]

The following replacements of vowels were found:

Interchange of ο and ω:[111]

ω for ο:[112] He 8:6, 12:1c; 1 Cor 13:12b; 2 Cor 3:6.[113]

ο for ω:[114] He 13:21b; 2 Cor 7:15b.[115]

ου for ω (medially):[116] Ro 16:12.

ο for ωο:[117] Eph 2:5b.

ο for ου:[118] 2 Cor 10:4; Eph 3:1; Col 1:7a.

ο for α:[119] 1 Cor 11:34b.[120]

οι for αι:[121] Col 3:16b.

η for ο:[122] 1 Cor 15:22.

There are four cases of interchange of α and ε, and we may well have here confusion of similar grammatical forms. However, since this interchange occurs "frequently,"[123] they are included here rather than as nonsense in context readings.

ε for α:[124] He 6:6; 1 Cor 10:9a.

α for ε:[125] He 12:15a, 13:17.

α for η:[126] He 10:22.[127]

η for α:[128] 1 Cor 15:41a.

αι for α (medially):[129] Col 3:19.

ει for ε:[130] 1 Cor 14:9.

ε for ει:[131] 1 Cor 12:21.

ι (= ει) for ιει:[132] Php 4:5a.

η for ει:[133] 1 Cor 15:39.

η for ι:[134] 1 Cor 16:22.

ε for η:[135] 2 Cor 9:9.

ε for ευ:[136] He 11:15a.

There are also several cases of loss of vowels.

aphaeresis of ἀ-:[137] Ro 15:12b; Eph 4:10.

aphaeresis of ἐ-:[138] 1 Cor 10:29.

loss of α:[139] 1 Cor 10:21d, 15:10b; 2 Cor 11:25b.

loss of ι:[140] He 9:6; Ga 3:10b.

loss of ο:[141] 1 Cor 14:7, 16:7b; Ga 3:10a.

Nonsense Readings.--Looking first at strictly nonsense readings, we find 12 singulars in P^{46} which are words unknown to grammar or lexicon. Most of these involve just one or two letters, and indeed demonstrate, as did the orthographic peculiarities of P^{46}, how easily the scribe departed from his *Vorlage*.

The causes of these 12 strictly nonsense readings are as follows:

1. Addition of a letter: Ro 16:26; He 6:13.
2. Omission of a letter: Ro 6:14.
3. Replacement of a letter: Php 3:5b.
4. Addition of two letters: Ro 15:13; 2 Cor 4:6.[142]
5. Omission of two letters (in each case by a leap): 1 Cor 15:20 (κεκοιμημενων); Eph 3:8 (ελαχιστοτερω), 6:13 (δυνηθητε).
6. Other confusions: He 5:6 (επευξ for ιερευς),[143] 6:1 (θεμελι- for τελει-),[144] 12:15b (-χη- [or -χι-] for -οχ-).[145]

The 12 strictly nonsense readings constitute 1.8% of the singulars of P^{46}. But while the scribe of P^{46} thus manages to write known words (or orthographic variants of known words) in 98.2% of his singulars, he clearly fares less well in making his text readable. For there are 44 further singulars which are nonsense in context,[146] thus constituting 6.6% of the singulars. The total of 56 nonsense readings is 8.4% of all the singulars.

The conclusion would seem to be warranted that the scribe does not have an accurate sense of the meaning of the text which he is copying. Consequently, one might well have doubts as to the scribe's knowledge of Greek grammar.[147] But, in fact, what we usually see is that the scribe has been misled by the context into writing something which is indeed nonsense, or has made some rather evident slip. An instructive example is He 12:25, where the scribe was evidently influenced by the previous clause (τον . . . χρηματιζοντα) and by the fact that τον tert has no explicit noun, to delete οι and alter αποστρεφομενοι to αποστρεφομενον.[148] Here the scribe certainly shows some awareness of grammar.

A classification of most of these readings which are nonsense in context may be given as follows:

Sound confusion: Ro 12:7.[149]

Visual confusion: He 9:3b (Ν for ΓΙ),[150] 10:24 (ϵΙϹ for ϵΚ).[151]

Similar word: He 8:5b (metathesis),[152] 9:5a (verb of vs. 2),[153] 12:10c (metathesis); 1 Cor 9:10a, 9:10b, 12:26.

Scribal leap: Ga 4:9 (πτωχα στοιχ(ε)ια).[154]

Dittography: Ro 8:38; 2 Cor 3:11; Php 2:18, 4:6.

Omission and lacuna: He 10:10,[155] 13:25.[156]

Omission: He 10:25b;[157] 2 Cor 3:1b. Php

Addition: 1 Cor 2:3 (εν ter in vs. 3);[158] 2 Cor 13:3;[159] Eph 2:16; Col 2:1 (μου later in vs. 1).[160]

The scribe appears to have difficulty understanding the abbreviations for nomina sacra which stood in his Vorlage, and accordingly often introduces an impossible form. In 2 cases (He 6:6, 12:14c) the variation is just considered as orthographic, and in 4 cases (1 Cor 2:15; 2 Cor 7:1a, 10:7b; Eph 4:15) what the scribe writes happens (accidentally, it is clear) to be more or less sensical. But there are 5 cases of nonsense: He 12:24;[161] 1 Cor 2:14, 3:1, 4:21, 15:24.[162] The readings at 1 Cor 2:14, 3:1, and 4:21 are especially interesting, since there the scribe overlooked the distinctive endings and collapsed three distinct words into π̅ν̅ς̅.

There is, further, one example of confusion of gender: Eph 3:18b.[163] And there are 10 cases of confusions which involve changes in verbs: Ro 15:23; He 7:15,[164] 12:4a, 12:25; 1 Cor 14:18b, 14:24; Eph 4:4; Ga 3:21, 3:27, 5:16.[165] Finally, there are 6 nonsense in context readings which remain: He 10:25c, 12:8; Ga 1:11a; Php 1:13, 1:20b; Col 2:23.[166]

Our analysis of the nonsense readings in P46 probably understates the tendency of the scribe to create mere blunders, since quite a few readings which could well be viewed as nonsense have been classified as orthographic singulars.[167] In fact, Hoskier argues that some of these readings are neither orthographic nor nonsense, but likely give the authentic text:

> Certain passages involving a nominative, instead of an accusative, have been put down as errors, but, from the look of it, I am thinking that Paul was addicted to what we might call the "colon" or "videlicet" method, with an asyntactic plunge into a vivid continuation, irrespective of the previous construction, thus suddenly halted--to admit of a beautiful emphasis.[168]

Of course, it is not at all impossible that the letters of Paul could have originally contained passages which displayed grammatical constructions which are less than ideal. Indeed, it is clear that Paul's letters do contain harsh and awkward sentences.[169] But to attribute "an asyntactic plunge" to Paul on the basis of P46 alone is to place far too much weight on a document which is certainly full of mistakes. Hoskier had, I believe, the correct idea when he said:

> My point is that, unless you find out first whether P^{46} is a chronic bungler, or not, you cannot assess such a place as this [He 8:5a] at anything like its true value.[170]

Unfortunately, though, Hoskier's own investigation hardly provides the basis for such an evaluation of P^{46}. For he attempts to find justifications for readings which are obviously impossible,[171] and often claims versional support which does not exist.[172] Moreover, Hoskier simply ignores some clear slips in P^{46}.[173] Hoskier even refers to Benoit's "over-emphasis upon the little errors here and there to be found in P^{46}."[174] But such a remark hardly does justice to the vast quantity of singulars in P^{46}.

Rather, the analysis here would appear to confirm Tasker's comment that P^{46} "is very carelessly written" and has "a great number of crude scribal errors."[175] Zuntz has a similar judgment: "P^{46} is by no means a good manuscript. The scribe committed very many blunders."[176] These opinions will be further supported as we turn to an examination of the 471 significant singulars.

Additions.--There are 55 singulars (11.7% of the significant singulars) which are additions to the text. Only two of these are of more than one word: Ro 8:34, where the addition of αμα δε seems to be intended to clarify the grammatical relationships among the clauses in vss. 33-34;[177] and He 5:10, where P^{46} has harmonized to the citation of Ps 110:4 in He 5:6. In fact, P^{46} reads συ ει in all four allusions to Ps 110:4 in Hebrews: 5:6, 5:10, 7:17, and 7:21, while only P 629 pc have ει in 5:6, and only D^{c} K P 326 1175 al have it in 7:17 and 7:21 (as does 1739 also at the latter place).[178] It is thus clear that P^{46} has been most successful in eliminating any discrepancies among these four allusions.

Of the remaining 53 additions of one word, 2 (2 Cor 4:11a and Php 4:18a) are due to dittography.[179] These 53 may be classified as follows:

a) Conjunctions and particles (21 cases, of which 13 may be harmonizations to context):

και (8): Ro 15:16b; He 8:9a (και bis in vs. 8), 9:5b, 11:22 (και in vs. 22b[180]); 1 Cor 8:6; 2 Cor 1:2 (και in vs. 2b), 6:16; Php 3:17 (και in vs. 17a).

οτι: Ro 10:15;[181] 1 Cor 12:16b (οτι in vs. 12a); 2 Cor 9:2a (οτι in vs. 2b).

η:[182] Ro 14:4 (gives η...η), 16:17c (gives η...η).

δε: 1 Cor 8:1 (δε in vs. 1d); Php 4:18a.

γαρ: He 8:2a (γαρ in vs. 3); Col 3:6b.

αλλα: Php 1:18b (αλλα in vs. 1e).

τε: Ro 15:19 (gives τε και).

ιδου: 2 Cor 6:8 (ιδου in vs. 9).

δη: 1 Cor 15:49.[183]

b) Articles (14 cases, of which 5 may be harmonizations to context): Ro 11:13 (τοις εθνεσιν in vs. 13a); He 11:14, 13:21a;[184] 1 Cor 5:1b,[185] 10:21a, 10:21c; 2 Cor 3:18b, 3:18c (οι with μεταμορφουμενοι [P^{46} A 614 1906]), 4:11a; Eph 2:6 (τω in vs. 5), 2:7 (τω in vs. 5 and vs. 6 [P^{46} alone]); Php 1:10; Col 3:24 (article as in vss. 23 and 25), 4:11a.

c) Pronouns (7 cases, all of which are harmonizations): Ro 13:14b (general usage: κυριος ημων); He 7:2a (harmonization with Gn 14:20 LXX: και εδωκεν αυτω δεκατην απο παντων[186]); 1 Cor 2:8b (δοξαν ημων in vs. 7),[187] 15:58 (μου in vs. 58a); Eph 1:15 (general usage: κυριος ημων [as in vs. 17]), 2:1 (υμων in vs. 1b); Ga 6:14 (με from εμοι in vs. 14a).

d) Verbs (4 cases, of which 2 may be harmonizations to context): Ro 16:17b (ποιουντας in vs. 17); 1 Cor 9:15a;

Ga 2:15; Php 3:18 (βλεπετε parallel to σκοπειτε in vs. 17).

e) Prepositions (3 cases, 2 of which may be harmonizations to context): 1 Cor 14:18a (υπερ after ευχαριστω), 14:19a (εν bis in vs. 19);[188] 2 Cor 9:2b.[189]

f) Adverb: 2 Cor 12:19a (ου bis in vs. 18).

There remain 3 additions which are, I believe, most plausibly viewed as conflations: Ro 16:19; 2 Cor 10:8; and Php 1:11. Both Sanders[190] and Zuntz[191] bring forward evidence to indicate that P46 was copied from a manuscript which had corrections noted within it. This hypothesis would certainly explain how the 3 readings considered here arose: the scribe either misunderstood the correction and produced a conflated text, or was uncertain which reading to adopt and so preserved both in his conflations. Moreover, it is significant that 2 of these readings can be seen as having been conflated from readings present in clearly defined textual groups: at both Ro 16:19 and Php 1:11 P46 has conflated the reading of F G with that found in almost all other manuscripts.[192] P46 thus provides clear evidence that the text now found in F G was already circulating in the second century. At 2 Cor 10:8 the two readings are not so neatly divided, and of course they differ simply by the interchange of ο and ω.[193]

We see, then, that the 55 additions are, to a significant extent (31 cases), often the result of harmonizations of various types, the most common being to the immediate context. Only 57 words are added to the text by means of these 55 scribal creations, for an average of hardly more than one word (1.036, to be more precise) per addition.

Omissions.--P^{46} contains 167 singulars which result from the omission of one or more words, and these 167 omissions constitute 35.5% of the significant singulars. Benoit has especially emphasized this feature of the copying by the scribe of P^{46}:

> Mais il est une tendance que l'on a déjà signalée et qui caractérise vraiment P^{46}: *sa brièveté* et même, osons-nous dire, *sa hâte*. Notre scribe est pressé; tout en s'appliquant, il veut finir vite et son oeil saute des mots, voire des phrases. . . . Ces omissions, et beaucoup d'autres, sont-elles dues seulement à une certaine hâte coupable du copiste, ou bien remontent-elles à un réviseur qui a le *goût des leçons plus courtes, plus légères*? On pourra opiner dans le second sens pour ce qui regarde les verbes composés.[194]

A similar judgment is made by Zuntz, who, in his survey of the singulars in P^{46}, says: "The omissions, indeed, form the most serious chapter, affecting as they do the question of the 'shorter text.'"[195] Hoskier, on the other hand, has claimed that at least some of these omissions are correct, but without, as far as can be seen, any support other than an a priori fondness for the shorter text.[196] Some of his specific comments and those of other scholars will be considered as we cover these singular readings.

Probably most clearly secondary are the 38 omissions of two or more words, as many as 26 of which result from homoeoteleuton.[197] These 38 longer omissions are:

Ro 8:17a (2 words: κληρονομοι κληρονομοι, and omit μεν)

Ro 8:23 (2 or 3 words)

Ro 12:8 (4 words: εν ... εν[198])

Ro 14:18 (4 words: ευαρεστος ... δοκιμος)

He 2:8a (2 words[199])

He 8:8 (4 words: λεγει ... λεγει[200])

He 8:12 (6 words: αυτων ... αυτων[201])

He 9:14 (11 words: τω θεω ... τω θεω[202])

He 12:6-7 (21 words: παιδευει ... παιδευει)

He 13:24b (4 words)

1 Cor 6:12 (7 words: παντα μοι εξεστιν αλλ ου ... παντα μοι εξεστιν αλλ ουκ)

1 Cor 8:3 (2 words)[203]

1 Cor 9:7 (2 words:[204] γαλακτος της ποιμνης)

1 Cor 9:20 (9 words: κερδησω ... κερδησω)

1 Cor 10:28 (5 words: εκεινον ... συνειδησιν)

1 Cor 15:40 (6 words: η των επουρανιων ... η των επιγειων)

2 Cor 1:6-7 (18 words: αυτων παθηματων ... των παθηματων)

2 Cor 4:7 (2 words)

2 Cor 8:19a (9 words: των εκκλησιων ... των εκκλησιων)

2 Cor 8:19-20 (23 words: χαριτι ταυτη τη [omit P^{46}] διακονουμενη υφ ημων προς ... αδροτητι ταυτη τη διακονουμενη υφ ημων προνοουμεν)

2 Cor 10:12a (2 words: εγκριναι η συγκριναι)

2 Cor 11:6 (8 words)

2 Cor 11:12 (3 words: αφορμην ... αφορμην)

2 Cor 11:25a (2 words: ἐῥραβδισθην απαξ ελιθασθην;[205])

2 Cor 12:19b (2 words)

Eph 1:3 (10 words: κυριου ιησου χριστου ... κυριου ημων ιησου χριστου)

Eph 2:15 (2 words)

Eph 5:5 (2 words[206])

Eph 6:12b (3 words: πονηριας ... επουρανιοις)[207]

Ga 2:3 (3 words)

Ga 2:5a (2 words)

Ga 4:6 (2 words)

Ga 4:14b (2 words: εξουθενησατε ουδε εξεπτυσατε)

Php 3:10 (4 words: αυτου ... αυτου)

Php 3:14b (3 words: θυ ... ιηυ)

Php 4:17 (4 words: επιζητω το ... επιζητω τον)

Col 1:27 (2 words: πλουτος της δοξης του)

Col 3:1-2 (12 words: τα ανω ... τα ανω)

These 38 omissions cause the loss of 211 words from the *Vorlage* of P^{46}. While the shorter omissions found here (2-4 words) occur, as it seems, either by homoeoteleuton or simple carelessness, the longer omissions (5-23 words) almost always arise by homoeoteleuton. The only exception is 2 Cor 11:6, where 8 words are omitted for no apparent reason. But this omission consists of 36 letters, and it seems quite possible that the omitted words could have formed one line in the *Vorlage* of P^{46}, which was thus skipped by the scribe.[208]

The remaining 129 omissions of one word only may be classified as follows:

a) Conjunctions and particles (38 cases, perhaps 4 by a leap):

και (11): Ro 8:17c; He 1:2, 7:25a; 1 Cor 7:30, 14:21b; 2 Cor 1:11, 8:2, 11:9; Eph 5:11a; Ga 3:4 (γε και[209]), 6:4b (εξει και)

δε (10):: Ro 15:20; He 7:21, 11:1;[210] 1 Cor 8:9a (βλεπετε

... δε), 16:6; 2 Cor 2:14, 4:18, 13:7; Ga 3:12; Php 2:24.

γαρ (5):[211] He 10:26a, 12:10a, 13:11a; 1 Cor 9:16; Ga 3:28c.

οτι (3): Ro 9:6; 1 Cor 15:12; 2 Cor 1:5a.

μεν (2): 1 Cor 1:18; 2 Cor 10:10.

τε (2): He 6:4 (τε της), 11:32b.

εαν (1): 1 Cor 13:3.

και or δε (1): 1 Cor 15:41b.

ουν (1): 1 Cor 14:11 (εαν ουν).

επει (1): 1 Cor 15:29.

διο (1): Eph 4:25.

b) Articles (32 cases, perhaps 10 by a leap): Ro 9:4 (και η[212]), 11:24 (ουτοι οι), 12:1b, 13:4a, 13:10, 15:12a; He 2:8c, 5:12 (τινα τα[213]), 7:1a, 8:2b, 9:3a (σκηνη η), 9:12a,[214] 11:17, 12:14b; 1 Cor 7:22, 8:9b, 11:24b, 14:13 (διο ο), 14:33b (πασαις ταις), 15:9, 15:48 (και οι); 2 Cor 1:20 (αυτω το[215]), 2:3, 4:4, 8:19b (ταυτη τη), 9:13 (επι τη[216]), 10:18; Eph 4:9b, 5:14; Ga 1:4, 5:9; Php 3:14a.

c) Pronouns (27 cases, perhaps 4 by a leap): Ro 6:6, 9:1, 9:3a, 9:26b, 10:8, 10:19, 12:1a, 15:31a, 16:2a;[217] He 7:16 (ετερος ος[218]), 12:16b, 13:7a (ηγουμενων υμων); 1 Cor 8:2 (εγνωκεναι τι), 8:9c, 11:22, 12:9;[219] 2 Cor 1:5b, 2:13, 6:18, 7:4, 11:1 (μου μικρον); Eph 1:9 6:11; Ga 5:14b;

Php 1:8a, 3:1, 4:3a.

d) Prepositions (7 cases, perhaps 1 by a leap): Ro 13:13;[220] He 4:6; 1 Cor 15:31b; 2 Cor 11:27, 12:6c (τις εις εμε); Eph 1:5; Ga 4:23.

e) Verbs (6 cases, perhaps 3 by a leap): He 8:5c (ποιησεις παντα); 1 Cor 8:12 (συνειδησιν ασθενουσαν), 11:26; 2 Cor 3:7; Ga 3:19; Php 3:20 (σωτηρα απεκδεχομεθα).

f) Adverbs (6 cases, perhaps 2 by a leap): He 4:7b,[221] 12:26; 1 Cor 5:12a, 13:12a (γαρ αρτι δι); 2 Cor 1:9; Eph 4:30 (και μη[222]).

g) Nouns (6 cases, perhaps 2 by a leap): He 4:7a,[223] 7:27a (αμαρτιων θυσιαν, if the *Vorlage* read θυσιαν), 9:3c,[224] 10:39,[225] 11:16 (θ̅ς̅ θ̅ς̅); 1 Cor 14:10.

h) Adjectives (5 cases, perhaps 1 by a leap): Ro 11:16; He 12:23, 13:24a;[226] 2 Cor 3:18a, 13:13 (του αγιου).

i) Proper names (2 cases): 1 Cor 9:9, 15:45.

The fact that the scribe of P^{46} can omit so much of the text without producing nonsense makes evident that he manages to grasp the sense of what he is writing. We noted, in fact, only five nonsense in context readings which arose from omissions or leaps: He 10:10, 10:25b, 13:25; 2 Cor 3:1b; Ga 4:9. It is true that some of the other omissions alter the sense of the text in a striking fashion.[227] Nevertheless, as was the case with P^{45}, it is clear that the scribe of P^{46} omits conjunctions, articles, and pronouns--whose omission usually results at worst in asyndeton or unclarity--, much more often than he omits nouns and verbs. In some cases, of course, one might think that this terseness reflects stylistic considerations, but in general there seems to be ample evidence to support Benoit's view that the scribe of P^{46} displays a very clear tendency to omit.

If we compare the overall patterns of additions and omissions, we see that P^{46} adds a total of 57 words in its 55 additions, as already noted earlier. On the other hand, the scribe omits a total of 340 words[228] in its 167 omissions, for an average of slightly more than two words (2.036, to be more precise) per omission. So the omissions in P^{46} are not only much more frequent than the additions, but also tend to be longer. Looking at the total picture, we see that our scribe's errors of addition and omission have resulted in a net loss of 283 words from the Vorlage, a figure which again makes evident that the tendency of P^{46} is to produce a shorter text.

Transpositions.--Among the singulars of P^{46} we find 37 transpositions,[229] constituting 7.9% of the significant singulars. Perhaps 13 of these were caused by an initial scribal leap, followed by a correction being made by inserting the omitted words afterwards:

Ro 8:32a ημων παντων παρεδωκεν αυτον

Ro 11:36 οτι εξ αυτου και δι αυτου

Ro 15:15a απο ... αναμιμνησκων

Ro 15:18 τολμησω τι[230]

Ro 16:14 ερμην πατροβαν ερμαν

He 2:8b ουδεν αφηκεν αυτω

He 7:20 ορκωμοσιας ... ορκωμοσιας εισιν ιερεις

1 Cor 1:28 ινα τα οντα καταργηση

1 Cor 12:8 δια ... διδοται

1 Cor 12:12 και μελη εχει πολλα or και μελη πολλα εχει[231]

1 Cor 14:25b οντως ο θεος εν υμιν εστιν or ο θεος οντως εν υμιν εστιν

2 Cor 5:6 ενδημουντες εν τω σωματι

2 Cor 7:3 εν ... εστε

Some of these leaps, though, would be rather improbable, and in fact, as in the case of P^{45}, we need not postulate an initial error of a leap in order to explain a transposition. For P^{46}, as we have just seen, omits words and phrases very frequently without such leaps, and many such omissions could be "corrected" into transpositions. And indeed we find the following 24 transpositions with no such initial error: Ro 8:30b,[232] 8:32b, 11:22,[233] 11:27, 13:14a, 15:33, 16:2c,[234] 16:15a;[235] He 3:3, 9:15b, 12:17a; 1 Cor 8:5,[236] 9:15b, 10:16, 11:24a, 13:4, 13:13,[237] 14:36, 15:10a; 2 Cor 1:19,[238] 5:1, 8:7b; Eph 1:17; Col 2:13.

Our scribe's apparent inability to grasp fully the sense of what he is writing apart from the immediate context results in his transpositions being comparatively short. The lengths of the texts involved are:[239]

2 words: 14 cases
2 or 3 words: 1 case (1 Cor 12:12)
3 words: 10 cases
4 words: 6 cases
5 words: 2 cases
5 or 6 words: 1 case (1 Cor 14:25b)
6 words: 1 case (1 Cor 13:13)
7 words: 1 case (He 7:20)

Also included in the transpositions is Ro 15:33, which is the displacement of 16:25-27 to this position in the text. The amount of text involved here (about 400 words if we assume that the Vorlage had the text of ς P^{61} ℵ B C D) makes it difficult to imagine that such a displacement would be "merely one of several idiosyncrasies of the scribe of P^{46}."[240] Rather, it must be presumed that the position in P^{46} is one witness to the larger set of problems concerning these verses and the final chapter of Romans.[241]

Harmonizations.--There is, of course, comparatively little occasion for our scribe to assimilate the text which he is copying to parallel accounts. However, 5 readings appear to have arisen by such harmonization. As already noted, the addition at He 7:2a agrees with Gn 14:20 LXX, and the addition at He 5:10 agrees with Ps 110:4 LXX (as cited in He 5:6]. The plural θυσιας at He 13:15 agrees with the plural found at He 9:9, 10:1, and 10:11.[242] At 1 Cor 11:24a the transposition agrees with the parallels at Mt 26:26, Mk 14:22, and Lk 22:19 in having τουτο εστιν. The substitution at 1 Cor 16:15 gives απαρχη της ασιας, thus agreeing with Ro 16:5.[243]

On the other hand, harmonizations to the context account for a significant number of the singulars of P^{46}. In fact, perhaps as many as 104 of the 471 significant singulars have this cause.[244] These harmonizations may be classified as additions, omissions, replacements, and transpositions. We then find the following pattern among these 104 singulars:

Replacement	Addition	Omission	Transposition
64 (61.5%)	30 (28.8%)	8 (7.7%)	2 (1.9%)

It is remarkable that the pattern here is quite close to the pattern found among the harmonizations to context in P^{45}, except for the fact that fewer of P^{45}'s singulars with this cause were replacements while rather more were transpositions. (In view of the higher frequency with which P^{45} transposes, this is perhaps to be expected.) The comparatively small number of omissions resulting from harmonization to context confirms that such an error is less likely than is addition or replacement.

These 104 harmonizations to context may be classified as follows:

a) Addition (30 cases): Ro 11:13 (τοις εθνεσιν in vs. 13a), 14:4 (η...η), 16:17b (ποιουντας in vs. 17b), 16:17c (η...η); He 8:2a (γαρ in vs. 3), 8:9a (και bis in vs. 8), 11:22 (και...και);[245] 1 Cor 2:8b (δοξαν ημων in vs. 7), 8:1 (δε in vs. 1d), 9:15a (η...η), 12:16b (οτι in vs. 16a), 14:18a (gives ευχαριστω υπερ), 14:19a (εν in vs. 19b), 15:58 (μου in vs. 58a); 2 Cor 1:2 (και in vs. 2b), 3:18c (οι...μεταμορφουμενοι [in P^{46} A 614]), 6:8 (ιδου in vs. 9b); 9:2a (οτι in vs. 2b), 9:2b (? cf. 8:1),[246] 12:19a (ου bis in vs. 18); Eph 2:1 (υμων in vs. 1b), 2:6 (τω in vs. 5), 2:7 (τω in vs. 5 and in vs. 6 [P^{46}]); Ga 2:15 (? ιουδαιος υπαρχων in vs. 14 and ελλην ων in vs. 3), 6:14 (εμοι in vs. 14a); Php 1:18b (αλλα και in vs. 18), 3:17 (και in vs. 17a), 3:18 (σκοπειτε in vs. 17), 4:18a (δε in vs. 18a);[247] Col 3:24 (article as in vs. 23 and vs. 24b).

b) Substitution (41 cases): Ro 10:16 (καθως γεγραπται in vs. 15), 15:7 (ιησου χριστου in vs. 6), 15:16a (δια in vs. 15); He 5:1b (περι αμαρτιων in vs. 3), 9:22a (νεκροις in vs. 17), 10:26b (see the next reading), 10:29 (κατα- in vs. 20, in vs. 23, in vs. 24, and in vs. 29b), 11:21 (took ιωσηφ as ιακωβ in vs. 21a); 1 Cor 1:13 (η...η), 10:4 (επιον in vs. 4a), 11:7 (την κεφαλην εικων and υπαρχων in vs. 7), 12:10 (ετερω in vs. 10d), 12:16a (ο πους in vs. 15), 15:10d (η εις εμε in vs. 10a), 15:17 (ει in vs. 16, in vs. 17a, and in vs. 19), 15:47 (πνευματικον *bis* in vs. 46),[248] 16:5 (παρα- *bis* in vs. 6); 2 Cor 4:8 (και μη in vs. 7), 7:7 (ημιν in vs. 7), 7:15a (ημων in vs. 14c), 9:1 (comparative [adverb] in 7:13 and 7:15), 9:12 (ευχαριστιαν in vs. 11); Eph 2:4 (εν ελεει in vs. 4a), 2:5a (? influence of νεκρους before), 3:7 (του θεου in vs. 7a), 3:11 (κυριω in vs. 11b), 3:13 (ημων in vs. 13b [according to P^{46} C 33 69** pc]), 5:2 (οσμην in vs. 2b), 6:12a (μεθοδειας in vs. 11);[249] Ga 2:9 (πετρος in vs. 7 and in vs. 8),[250] 3:18 (δι in vs. 18b), 3:28a (ουκετι in vs. 25), 3:28b (ουκετι in vs. 25 and in vs. 28a [P^{46}]),[251] 4:14a (εν τη σαρκι *μου*), 4:27 (ουκ in vs. 27b), 5:12 (αρα in vs. 11b); Php 2:7 (ανθρωπος in vs. 7c),[252] 2:26 (πεμψαι προς υμας in vs. 25b), 3:3 (εν *bis* in vs. 3b); Col 1:16 (οτι in vs. 16a); 1 Th 1:10 (? υπομονης in vs. 3).

c) Transposition (2 cases): Ro 8:30b (τουτους και in vs. 30a); 1 Cor 9:15b (gives μαλλον η).

d) Omission (8 cases): Ro 13:13 (the other nouns in vs. 13 in the dative without εν);[253] He 9:3c (contrast with 9:2 αγια αγιων [P^{46} A D*]),[254] 9:12a (anarthrous αιματος in vs. 12a);[255] 1 Cor 5:12a (ουχι not in vs. 13), 9:9 (ο νομος in vs. 8), 11:22 (υμας not in vs. 22b); 2 Cor 1:20 (anarthrous ναι in vs. 18 and bis in vs. 19), 6:18 (emphatic pronoun not in vs. 18a).

e) Grammatical attraction (23 cases):

Ro 9:5: ο attracted to ο χριστος

Ro 10:14b: subjunctive attracted to πιστευσωσιν and κηρυξωσι in vss. 14-15[256]

Ro 11:6a: χαρις bis in vs. 6

He 6:5: γευεσθαι with genitive in vs. 4[257]

He 7:12: infinitive attracted to ανιστασθαι and λεγεσθαι in vs. 11

He 7:13: aorist attracted to προσεσχεν (P^{46} A C 33 81 1739 pc)

He 8:11a: singular attracted to εκαστος (ετερος P^{46})

He 9:12b: αιωνια attracted to τα αγια[258]

He 9:15a: τουτου attracted to του χριστου in vs. 14[259]

He 11:23a: nominative attracted to μωυσης[260]

He 11:33: βασιλεις attracted to οι (taken as article) and verb then omitted[261]

He 11:40b: nominative plural attracted to παντες in vs. 39

1 Cor 5:1a: ακουω attracted to ελθω in 4:21

1 Cor 9:25b aorist subjunctive attracted to λαβωσιν

1 Cor 11:14: αυτης refers to γυναικα in vs. 13

2 Cor 8:5a: first person plural attracted to ηλπισαμεν

2 Cor 12:6b: καυχησομαι attracted to εσομαι and φειδομαι

2 Cor 13:4: ζωμεν attracted to ασθενουμεν

Ga 2:12a: τινα attracted to ηλθεν (P^{46} ℵ B D* F G 33 pc)[262]

Ga 2:17: subjunctive attracted to δικαιωθωμεν in vs. 16

Ga 4:15: εξορυξατε attracted to εδωκατε

Ga 6:7: α attracted to ταυτα (P^{46} D* F G it vg)

Col 1:28: participle attracted to νουθετουντες and διδασκοντες

Finally, there are 6 readings which should probably be viewed as harmonizations to general usage:

Ro 13:14b and Eph 1:15: The addition of ημων after κυριος is very frequent, although not, of course, universal.

1 Cor 7:40: Only here does the comparative of μακαριος occur in the New Testament, and the scribe of P^{46} has thus followed the prevailing usage.

Eph 5:5: Our scribe has introduced the fixed phrase βασιλεια του θεου, in place of the phrase βασιλεια του χριστου και θεου, which occurs only here within the New Testament.[263]

Eph 5:14: In the New Testament we always find εκ νεκρων without the article except here, at Col 2:12 (om των P^{46} ℵ A C K L P 69 424** 1739 al), and at 1 Th 1:10 (om των ς $P^{46\text{vid}(?)}$ A C K al).[264]

Ga 2:5b: Our scribe has apparently introduced the phrase αληθεια (του) θεου from Ro 1:25, 3:7, and 15:8, in place of αληθεια του ευαγγελιου, which occurs only at Ga 2:5 and 2:14. P^{46} has it at the second occurrence, and so it seems that the scribe of P^{46} became convinced that the phrase was correct when he saw it for the second time at 2:14.

We see, then, that P^{46} has a total of 115 singulars which have arisen (or may well have arisen) through harmonization of one kind of another. The overall pattern of these readings is as follows:

	471 sign. singulars	115 harmonizations
104 to context	22.1%	90.4%
6 to usage	1.3%	5.2%
5 to parallels	1.1%	4.3%
115 harmonizations	24.4%	

We thus find that the pattern is similar to that found for P^{45}, with the understandable difference that P^{45} has a greater tendency toward harmonization to parallels. Obviously, the harmonizations created by the scribe of P^{46} are influenced, to an overwhelming degree, by the immediate context. The other sorts of harmonizations are virtually insignificant for the overall copying of this scribe.

Grammatical Changes.--As we have seen throughout, our scribe makes many errors affecting the grammar of what he is trying to copy. Many of these are simple slips, often caused (as it seems) by the influence of the context. But some changes are somewhat more systematic or betray perhaps a conscious attempt to improve on his *Vorlage*. Few, if any, of these have any claim to serious consideration as being older than P^{46} itself, but they do indicate a certain awareness by the scribe of what he was writing, and a willingness to alter what he read.

Fully 19 readings involve the interchange of grammatical forms. There are two cases of a double augment: Eph 2:2a; Ga 1:14.[265] And at 1 Cor 7:17 there is an augment with ε in the perfect,[266] while at Col 1:22a the augment is omitted. Five readings shift from εαυτος to αυτος:[267] He 1:3, 9:25a (involving also a shift in case); 1 Cor 7:38; 2 Cor 3:1a; Ga 6:4a. The reverse interchange occurs at He 12:10b.

Five more readings are created by the intrusion of the first aorist forms into the second aorist paradigm:[268] He 9:11, 11:15b, 12:9; Ga 1:17b; Php 4:10. At Ro 14:3 εσθειν replaces εσθιειν.[269] And 3 readings involve the interchange of forms of nouns: Ro 14:21 (κρεια),[270] Eph 5:31 (σαρκαν),[271] and Php 4:3b (βυβλω).[272]

Verbs.--In three cases P^{46} replaces a finite verb by a participle: 2 Cor 5:8b (with omission of και), Ga 4:10,[273] and Col 1:28 (harmonization to context). The one example of the shift from participle to finite verb, Ga 4:15, is a result of harmonization to context. There are two examples in each direction of the interchange of finite verb and infinitive; finite to infinitive: He 7:12 (harmonization to context) and Ga 5:14a; infinitive to finite: Ro 15:12c and 2 Cor 12:6b (harmonization to context).

There are the following changes in tense:

Present to aorist: He 12:28; 1 Th 5:6.[274]

Aorist to present: 2 Cor 12:11a; Eph 3:18a.

Imperfect to aorist: 1 Cor 10:4 (harmonization to context).

Perfect to aorist:[275] He 7:13 (harmonization to context); 1 Cor 2:8a.

Aorist to perfect: Eph 4:11.

Future to present: 2 Cor 13:4 (harmonization to context).[276]

There are also the following 9 shifts from indicative to subjunctive:[277] Ro 10:14b; 1 Cor 9:25, 11:33; 2 Cor 5:8a; Eph 5:15a; Ga 2:17, 6:16; Col 3:9. In three of these cases we perhaps have harmonization to context (Ro 10:14b; 1 Cor 9:25; Ga 2:17), and in several of the cases we may well have simply a confusion of similar sounds. And there are two changes from passive to active:[278] Ro 5:19;[279] 1 Cor 5:1a (harmonization to context). And at 1 Cor 10:27 there is a shift from present imperative to future indicative.

At 2 Cor 8:5a, under the influence of the context, there is a shift from third person plural to first person plural. At Ga 2:12b a shift occurs from third person singular to third person plural.[280] And at He 8:11a the singular verb is clearly a grammatical "improvement," occasioned by the singular subject.[281]

Conjunctions.--Many of these cases have already been noted. Clearly P^{46} tends to omit conjunctions more often than adding them, since there are 38 omissions of conjunctions and particles but only 21 additions. And fully 13 of these 21 additions may well have been caused by the context. We may especially note that P^{46} omits και 11 times,and adds it 8 times, omits γαρ 5 times and adds it twice, and omits δε 10 times while adding it only twice.

Besides these omissions and additions there are the following 21 replacements of one conjunction or particle by another:

αν becomes εαν:[282] Ro 9:26a; 1 Cor 11:34a.

ως becomes εως: Ro 15:24.

ως becomes οτι: Eph 5:24.

δε becomes τε: Ro 15:29; He 9:21, 13:16.

τε becomes δε: He 9:19.

ουδε becomes ουτε: Ro 9:7a; He 9:18; Ga 6:13.

ουτε becomes ουδε: 1 Cor 6:10.

γαρ becomes δε: Ro 12:20.

και becomes οι δε: 1 Cor 1:22.

και μη becomes δε: Col 1:23a.[283]

ειτε becomes ει: Php 1:18a.

οταν becomes εαν: 1 Cor 16:12.

καν becomes και: 2 Cor 11:16.

ει γαρ becomes ειπερ: Ga 6:3.

καιπερ becomes καιτοι: He 12:17b.

τοιγαρουν becomes τοιγαρ: He 12:1a.

No obvious pattern emerges from these data except the tendency to confuse δε/τε and ουδε/ουτε, and such confusions are common enough.[284]

Pronouns.--We have seen already that P^{46} omits 27 pronouns while adding only 7, all of the additions being harmonizations of one type or another. The tendency to omit words is thus clearly shown here, and, as noted in connection with P^{45}, this tendency may be a consequence of the scribe's desire to improve style. In any case, the direction of error is evidently toward removal of pronouns, with an only partially balancing tendency toward insertion of pronouns under the influence of the context, parallels, or general usage.

There are two shifts from singular to plural pronouns (Ga 4:14a, 6:7), and also two from plural to singular pronouns (2 Cor 7:7; Ga 2:12a). All of these are harmonizations to context. Moreover, P^{46} has 7 singular readings which change a second person plural pronoun to a first person plural pronoun, but no singular example of the reverse change: Ro 15:5; He 10:35; 2 Cor 7:11a, 7:15a, 9:14a, 9:14b; Eph 3:13. Two of these may be harmonizations (2 Cor 7:15a and Eph 3:13), but such confusion is common because of the similarity in the pronunciation of υ and η.[285]

Prefixes.--The preference for simple words to compound words which we saw in P^{45} is present to a more marked degree in P^{46}. Eleven omissions of prefixes are singular: Ro 8:17b, 12:16b; He 1:6, 6:11, 7:27b, 10:25a; Eph 2:2b; Ga 1:17a, 1:18, 2:13; Col 3:16a.[286] In three cases an internal leap is possible: Ro 12:16b (συναπαγομενοι);[287] Eph 2:2b (νυν ενεργουντος); Ga 1:18 (επεμεινα). And in

UMI

three cases P^{46} replaces a word which is rather rare in the New Testament: συναπαγω at Ro 12:16b and Ga 2:13,[287] and επισυναγωγη at He 10:25a.[288]

On the other hand, P^{46} adds only one prefix, at He 10:29, probably a result of harmonization to context. And there are 5 replacements of prefixes: He 10:26b; 1 Cor 13:5, 16:5; Ga 6:2; 1 Th 1:10. Of these perhaps 3 are harmonizations to context: He 10:26b; 1 Cor 16:5; 1 Th 1:10.

Proper Names.--There are 6 singulars which arise from the spelling of proper names.[289]

At 1 Cor 10:2 P^{46} writes μωυσεα. The accusative is usually μω(υ)σην, although this unusual form is also found at Lk 16:29 in ℵ B D L al.[290] At Ga 2:1 we find βαρναβας, presumably an unusual genitive in -ας, for which there seems to be no parallel.[291] And at 1 Cor 16:19 P^{46} has πρεισκας, the form suggesting that the scribe took this person to be a man,[292] perhaps under the influence of the preceding ακυλας. At Ro 16:3 P^{46} has the accusative πρεισκαν (agreeing with ℵ A B C D F G L P al), which could be either masculine or feminine.

The spelling βαραχ is found at He 11:32a, and this is likely just a confusion of κ and χ.[293] As it

UMI

happens, the Hebrew ק (in בָּרָק) is usually rendered by κ in the New Testament, with the exception of σαβαχθανι for שְׁבַקְתַּנִי in Mt 27:46 and Mk 15:34.[294] And at 2 Cor 9:2c P^{46} writes αχαινα for αχαια, which is one more example of the scribe's confusions regarding nasals.[295]

Besides these 6 singulars there is also the curious case at Ro 16:15a, where P^{46} writes: ασπασασθε φιλολογον και βηρεα και αουλιαν και κτλ. The confusion here is too great to postulate a mere alternative spelling for each of two names, and whatever the cause the scribe clearly has departed from his *Vorlage* to a remarkable degree.[296]

Special Cases.--There remain several singular readings which seem to involve special issues.

At Ro 15:15b P^{46} replaces ως by ουτως, and at 1 Cor 14:21c makes the reverse substitution. The most likely explanation of these errors is visual confusion. At Ro 15:15b the scribe found ΜΕΡΟΥϹΩϹ, and simply duplicated the ΟΥϹ, taking it first (correctly) as the final portion of μερους, and then taking it (incorrectly) with ως. And in order to make a word from this second combination of letters the scribe also made the easy transition from ΟΥϹΩϹ to ΟΥΤΩϹ. Such duplication of letters is unusual but not otherwise unknown.[297]

At 1 Cor 14:21c, on the other hand, the substitution appears to be the result of a leap from ουδ to ουτ in ουδ ουτως. The similarity in sound of δ and τ would facilitate such a leap.[298]

Zuntz thought that the reading of P^{46} at 1 Cor 1:8 "has its attractions," but decided that it was not authentic.[299] Benoit comments:

> εως (αχρι) τελους est demandé par le contexte eschatologique, τελειους semble amené par le qualificatif ανεγκλητους.[300]

At 1 Cor 14:25a P^{46} has substituted διανοιας for καρδιας. Benoit calls this reading "douteux, car διανοια ne figure que dans *Éph*., *Col*., *Heb*., jamais dans *I Cor*. ni dans les autres ép. de Paul."[301] Zuntz calls attention to the same variation at Eph 1:18,[302] remarking that "the early Christians were used to the equivalence of the two words."[303] In fact, διανοια is used in the LXX to translate לֵב and לֵבָב,[304] and the shift to διανοια at 1 Cor 14:25a serves to eliminate the Semitism with καρδια in favor of what seems to be the more natural expression in Greek.[305]

Benoit connects P^{46}'s surprising reading at 2 Cor 10:12c with the reading at He 9:22a, which the corrector replaced by the usual text.[306] Benoit says of both these readings where our scribe has introduced νεκρος/νεκροω into his text: "en voici deux qui s'expliqueraient si le copiste avait l'idée fixe de la mort."[307]

At Ga 5:14a the shift from εν τω αγαπησεις κτλ. to εν τω αγαπησαι κτλ. is described by Blass-Debrunner-Funk as having "smoothed" the original construction.[308]

Beare rightly points out that P[46]'s reading at He 10:1a "is no ordinary slip," and that the reading is at least possible.[309] Hoskier indeed thought that it was authentic.[310] However, Zuntz's careful examination led him to judge the reading "a wilful alteration, an alteration which could readily suggest itself to an attentive reader assessing the original text by the standards of educated Greek thought and mode of expression."[311] Zuntz went on to claim that such readings in P[46]

> are not due to a scribe's slovenliness: they are conjectures, and indeed ingenious conjectures, witnessing to attentive study of the text and perfect command of the Greek langmage. Our scribe found them in his copy and it is most unlikely that he should have been alone in propagating them.[312]

The latter sentence seems to be entirely gratuitous. At any rate there is no evidence for the existence of this reading elsewhere,[313] and so we may--on the basis of our working assumption--ascribe it to P[46]. This reading, moreover, hardly requires "perfect command of the Greek language" for its invention.[314] Conscious alteration, to be sure, is involved here, rather than a transcriptional oversight, but the alteration is quite straightforward. It happens that the verse in which the alteration is made invites metaphysical commentary,[315] and so what is a simple replacement can be viewed as an "ingenious" conjecture.

At He 12:16a the use of τας πρωτοτοκειας (as if from η πρωτοτοκεια) seems to be a conscious attempt at improvement on the form τα πρωτοτοκεια (or -ια) which is otherwise found in the LXX and here. It is interesting, though, that Aquila also uses τας πρωτοτοκειας,[316] and at a time not too much prior to P^{46}.

Theological Changes.--In a recent article Eshbaugh has suggested that some of the readings in P^{46} may have been motivated by theological considerations.[317] As evidence for this claim he looks at 6 readings in Galatians: 1:6, 2:20, 3:17, 3:19, 4:6, and 4:7. Only two of these are singular, 3:19 and 4:6, and so it is to these readings that we must turn to isolate whatever theological tendencies are operating in P^{46} itself, in contrast to an earlier tradition to which P^{46} witnesses. Now it happens that in both of these cases P^{46} has simply an omission. The overall frequency of omission of words of all sorts and of phrases of varying lengths by the scribe of P^{46} should make us wary of attributing any particular motives to the scribe in a few specific cases of omission, and closer examination of the readings which Eshbaugh discusses will show that accidental omission is a perfectly plausible explanation of P^{46}'s singular readings.

At Ga 3:19 P^{46} alone omits a verb, and Eshbaugh comments:

> The lack of a verb in P^{46} and the verb of the Western uncials, "was established," makes interpretation of the law as an insignificant, parenthetical afterthought less likely, if not impossible. Deletion of the verb "was added" also makes this passage more in harmony with 3:15 that states "no one annuls even a man's will, or *adds* to it." . . . While it is possible to interpret the UBS text as a disparagement of law, it is impossible to do so with the text of P^{46} and its supporting manuscripts [i.e., supporting in not having προσετεθη]. The law in P^{46} is either to contain and check evil deeds or to produce good deeds. This latter interpretation is supported by the Greek text of Claromontanus. This positive interpretation of the law is also found elsewhere in the Pauline corpus: "The law is good" (Rom. 7:12, 16b); and the law is one of the privileged possessions given to Israel by God (Rom. 9:5).[318]

The subtlety of this interpretation seems unnecessary as an explanation of P^{46}'s reading, since the omission here is only one of six examples of singular omissions of verbs to be found in P^{46}.[319] It is always possible, of course, that the scribe was aware of problems of exegesis, and emended the text for his own theological purposes. But there appears to be no compelling reason to adopt this line of argument when we can fit what P^{46} does here so easily into the pattern which he establishes elsewhere.

The second singular reading occurs at Ga 4:6, where P^{46} and Marcion omit του υιου. Eshbaugh remarks:

> This passage from the UBS text along with John 15:26 are the classical proof texts for the doctrine that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son (filioque). . . . In contrast the text of P^{46} states merely that God has sent his spirit. If P^{46} is a secondary text, its deletion may imply that this was done to show that the spirit proceeds only from the Father. However, if it is original, it may imply: (1) The Spirit does not come from the Son; or (2) the origin of the Spirit has not yet been considered a theological problem.[320]

Again, though, we see that the reading in P^{46} does not require such an explanation. For P^{46} omits six nouns with no Greek manuscript support, as well as five other nouns with their articles.[321]

It is likely, of course, that the dropping of nouns and verbs will in general have consequences for the interpretation of the text, and it is thus not surprising that some cases of such omission within texts dealing with theological issues could be seen as having theological implications. But the clearly established pattern of omission by the scribe of P^{46} makes such theories needlessly sophisticated, and makes it easier to presume that accidental omission has operated in the creation of both these readings.[322]

The other four readings of P^{46} considered by Eshbaugh have enough textual support that it is quite certain that the scribe of P^{46} took over these readings from his Vorlage.[323] Interestingly, though, two of these (1:6 and 3:17) are also omissions, and so if a tendency of P^{46} were to be required, accidental omission would again be relevant. The other two (2:20 and 4:7) involve changes in nomina sacra, and we have already seen that P^{46} frequently has difficulties with such words.[324] All in all, then, the readings cited by Eshbaugh do not seem adequate to sustain his thesis.[325]

We may note briefly that the situation here is in contrast to what we find in P^{72}, where there are three readings (Jd 5b; 1 Pe 5:1a; 2 Pe 1:2b) which do seem to arise from conscious theological considerations. The last of these is an omission, and so it could be explained as due to P^{72}'s tendency to omit. But the other two do not appear to fall under any general pattern found in P^{72}'s singular readings, and so here something other than mere slips or accidents was probably involved.[326] In the case of P^{46}, though, we have only two singular readings (among the readings cited by Eshbaugh), and for both of them the general pattern of omission provides an adequate explanation.

Summary.--The following appear to be the main features characterizing the copying activity of the scribe of P^{46}.

I. The scribe makes very many errors in spelling, demonstrating a great variety of confusions of similar sounds.

II. The scribe makes a number of errors which result in nonsense, despite frequent correction by him of his text. Many of these seem to arise from his faulty understanding of what he is copying, resulting in a high density of nonsense in context readings. In particular, he rather often errs when he encounters abbreviations of nomina sacra.

III. The scribe has a very marked tendency to omit portions of the text, most often only one word but longer phrases also. Some of these are due to scribal leaps, but most seem to have arisen from simple oversight or carelessness. The additions are not as frequent, and are often the results of harmonization to the context, although there are three examples of conflation from readings found in different textual groups.

IV. There are comparatively few transpositions, and these tend to be rather short, probably because the scribe cannot master the sense of what he is copying.

V. Harmonization of various kinds occurs, and by far the most pervasive is harmonization to the immediate context. This influence of the context seems to be the major factor in the scribe's occasional attempts to make stylistic or grammatical improvements.

Addenda.--To the list of singular readings should be added:

Hebrews 6:15 ουτως mss rell : ουτω P^{46} (et ς). This is an orthographic singular.[326]

The readings at 1 Cor 9:10a and 9:10b (ελπιζει for ελπιδι) were above characterized as nonsense in context readings; in fact, they should be considered orthographic singulars.[327]

These changes make no difference in the list of significant singulars.

UMI

FOOTNOTES

[1] The proposed datings in Aland, Repertorium, p. 273, range from perhaps second century ("etwa II") to the end of the third century. The editor, Kenyon, assigned the papyrus to the "first half of the third century" (The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Vol. III, Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text [London: Emery Walker, 1936], p. xiv).

[2] Kenyon, ibid., p. viii, and Aland, Repertorium, pp. 273-74. The extant portion of P^{46} actually ends with 1 Th 5:28 on f. 97^{v}. Since the codex was originally a single-quire codex of 104 folios, there would then be room for 2 Th, which Kenyon calculates to have taken about 4 pages. The remaining 10 pages, though, would not suffice for the Pastoral Epistles, although Phm could have been included. Kenyon suggests that a few leaves at the end were simply left blank (cf. Pauline Epistles, Text, pp. x-xi). By the way, on the basis of his knowledge of only part of now extant folios, Henry A. Sanders (A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul, University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXXVIII [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935], p. 10) conjectured that Phm came between Ga and Php. But the discovery of f. 86^{r}, on which Ga ends and Php begins, refutes this view (see Kenyon, Pauline Epistles, Text, p. x).

Metzger (Text, p. 38 n. 2) observes that six minuscule manuscripts also have He after Ro. An ancestor of B, of course, is known to have had He after Ga (ibid., p. 48). Cf. also Sanders, Codex, p. 12, on the order in P^{46}.

[3] See Kenyon, Pauline Epistles, Text, p. viii, and the figures in n. 1 there.

[4] Aland, Repertorium, p. 273. The history of the bringing together of these fragments is given by Kenyon, Pauline Epistles, Text, pp. vi-vii; cf. Sanders, Codex, p. 1.

[5] See the tables in Kenyon, *Pauline Epistles, Text*, pp. xv-xvi, and his summary statement on pp. xvi-xvii. Note also Sanders' earlier analysis in *Codex*, pp. 23-37.

[6] Among the manuscripts cited in Kenyon's tables (*Pauline Epistles, Text*, pp. xv-xvi), P^{46} agrees most often with B, except in He, where B has only 1:1-9:14. Kenyon also notes a number of agreements between P^{46} and B alone (pp. xix-xxi), and says (p. xxii): "there are several places where B stood alone against the other principal MSS., and now has the support of the papyrus." Cf. also Zuntz, *Text*, pp. 39-41, 61-62.

[7] Metzger, *Text*, p. 65.

[8] These are Ro 15:14, 16:17a; He 12:1d; 2 Cor 4:16; Col 4:11b. See Zuntz's comments in *ibid*., pp. 42-45, 68-69, 78-81.

[9] He 8:9b, 11:39; 1 Cor 5:13b; 2 Cor 1:10 (1739^{c}), 5:9, 8:14, 10:12b, 12:11b, 12:14; Ga 1:15, 4:11.

[10] This judgment is based on the collation published by Lake, de Zwaan, and Enslin, who remark ("Codex 1739," p. 141) that von Soden's apparatus "seems to give a very imperfect presentation of its readings."

[11] At least the collators cite numerous departures from the Textus Receptus which are not mentioned by von Soden. I suppose that it is more likely that von Soden simply overlooked such readings (if they were noted at all in the collation he used) or thought them unworthy of citation, than that the collators created these readings. See, however, the remarks of Zuntz, *Text*, pp. 69-71, and note 13 below.

[12] Agreement with 1739 was found at Ro 16:17a; 2 Cor 4:16; and Col 4:11b; agreement with B was found at 1 Cor 10:21b.

[13] Neither von Soden nor the collation of Lake *et al*. reports the reading of ευπερισπαστον at this place. But I suppose that the positive citation in these two recent editions is more reliable than the silence of the earlier collators. Zuntz, by the way, argued that P^{46} here preserved the authentic reading against all the other evidence (*Text*, pp. 25-29); he did not know, of course, of 1739's support.

[14] Pauline Epistles, Text, p. xiii. Sanders, Codex, p. 12, notes: "The writing is of the book hand type and the letters are carefully formed and well spaced." Zuntz, Text, p. 18, comments on the "neat appearance" of the papyrus, and says that "it was written by a professional scribe and corrected--but very imperfectly--by an expert."

[15] Kenyon, Pauline Epistles, Text, pp. xiii-xiv; Sanders, Codex, pp. 15-19.

[16] Pauline Epistles, Text, p. xiv; cf. Sanders, Codex, p. 17.

[17] Our total of 668 singulars compares with 654 "singulars" and "errors" cited in Kenyon's tables (Pauline Epistles, Text, pp. xv-xvi). However, there are 692 singulars noted in his apparatus. (I have not taken into account here the differing judgments concerning whether corrections are by the scribe or a later hand; this whole issue is discussed later on.) The discrepancies of our totals with his apparatus are explained as follows:

Romans: Kenyon's table gives 80 singulars and 11 errors, but his apparatus cites 97. He overlooks 12 readings (9:1, 9:3b, 11:5, 11:7b, 11:18, 11:28, 12:5, 13:4b, 14:21, 15:24, 16:26, 16:13), misinterprets 9:26a as agreeing with F G, and his printed text at 9:7b is incorrect. Moreover, I have divided 8:30, 9:11, 13:14, and 15:15 into two readings instead of his one. So we have 18 readings which Kenyon misses. On the other hand, he fails to note Greek support for 15 readings: 9:2 (which he counts as two), 9:16, 11:6b, 11:7a, 12:4, 12:14, 15:14, 15:17b, 15:26, 15:27, 16:7a, 16:15b, 16:17a, 16:17d. He also misreads 11:15, where P^{46} does have η. So we end up with 99 singulars here. (Kenyon also misinterprets the error at 12:8; and the reading of 14:21 is correctly given in Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Vol. III, Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Plates [London: Emery Walker, 1937], p. i.)

Hebrews: Kenyon's table gives 105 singulars and 36 errors, but his apparatus cites 163. He overlooks 13 readings (5:5, 6:13, 8:13, 9:25b, 10:1b, 10:3, 10:10, 12:5a, 12:5c, 12:5d, 13:7c, 13:16, 13:25), and misinterprets 2 readings as having support (1:3 and 12:3). His printed text is incorrect at 12:1b and 12:10a. And I have divided 12:14b and 12:14c. So we have 18 readings which Kenyon misses. On the other hand, he fails to note Greek support for 19 readings: 1:4 (= P), 4:11, 5:1a, 7:2 (om δε και cum 76), 7:2c, 7:11, 7:18, 8:9b, 9:20, 9:23 (= 442 463), 10:34a, 10:34b, 11:23b, 11:39, 11:40a, 12:1d, 12:18, 13:5, 13:24. He also misreads the text in 5 places where P^{46} has the majority reading: 6:11, 11:1 (a correction), 11:32 (another correction), 12:5, and 13:8. Kenyon counts two readings instead of one at 11:33, and at 11:4 there is no reason to assume that the text is singular (see *Pauline Epistles, Plates*, p. i, and the note of George D. Kilpatrick, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus P^{46} and Hebrews xi. 4," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 42 [1941], pp. 68-69). So we have 155 singulars here. (Kenyon also misinterprets the error at 11:17, since 330 [plus Ψ 2005 in von Soden] also omit αβρααμ.)

1 Corinthians: Kenyon's table gives 92 singulars and 35 errors, while his apparatus notes 139. He overlooks 13 readings (2:15, 3:7, 5:8, 7:4, 8:10, 9:8a, 10:13, 11:34a, 14:17, 14:19b, 14:33a, 15:10c, 15:41a), misinterprets 2 readings as having support (6:10 and 9:7), and prints 3 readings incorrectly (11:34b, 12:21, 16:22). Moreover, we divide 5:12 into 3 readings instead of his 1, and divide his 10:6 into 2. So we have 21 readings more than Kenyon. However, he misses Greek support for 17 readings: 1:21, 1:22 (= 322 323), 1:25, 4:3, 4:15, 5:13b, 7:10, 8:7, 9:8b, 10:21b, 11:23, 12:18 (= 33 547), 14:19c, 14:23, 15:31a (as noted in *Pauline Epistles, Plates*, p. i), 15:31 (om ημων cum D*), 16:7. Also, he misreads 1:31 (where P^{46} has κω), and counts 1 itacism (14:12). So we end up with 141 singulars here.

2 Corinthians: Kenyon's table has 87 singulars and 32 errors, but his apparatus cites 114. He overlooks 7 readings (1:12, 3:1a, 4:9, 7:5a, 7:6, 7:9, 8:7a), and counts 9:14 as 1 reading where we count 2. So we have 8 more than Kenyon. On the other hand, he misses Greek support for 22 readings: 1:10, 1:13 (= 4 33 122*), 1:17 (= 424**), 2:9, 4:3, 4:10, 4:16, 5:8c, 5:9, 5:9 (-ωμεθα = 69), 5:10, 5:14-15, 6:16 (om οτι cum 69), 7:5b, 8:5b, 8:14, 8:22, 10:12b, 12:6a, 12:11b, 12:14, and 13:10. He also fails to note the correction at 7:8, and includes 2 very doubtful readings where P^{46} may well have the majority reading (1:8 and 9:6). So we have 97 singulars here. (Kenyon also misses 3:15, which is supported by C, and misinterprets 5:20a, which is supported by Ψ.)

Ephesians: Kenyon's table cites 35 singulars and 16 errors, but his apparatus gives 54. He overlooks 7 readings (2:13, 2:17, 2:19, 4:28, 4:29, 5:15b, 5:27b), and misses Greek support for 5 readings: 3:8 (om αγιων cum 234*), 5:4, 5:11b, 6:8, 6:21 (= 33). So we have 56 readings here.

Galatians: Kenyon's table gives 46 singulars and 8 errors, although his apparatus has 57. He overlooks 8 readings (1:11b, 1:12, 2:2, 4:6, 4:24, 4:29, 5:14b, 6:4a), and misinterprets 4:27 as having the majority reading. So we have 9 which he doesn't have. However, he misses Greek support for 8 readings: 1:15, 2:14, 3:19 (om δι cum 102 489), 3:26, 4:11, 4:25 (= 33^{*vid}), 5:6, 5:10 (= 33 102). He also counts ουκετι ter at 3:28, even though the third occurrence is not extant, and fails to note that 1:14 (περισσοτερον) has been corrected (by the first hand) to the usual reading. So we end up with 56 singulars here.

Philippians: Kenyon's table has 30 singulars and 13 errors, while his apparatus cites 40. He overlooks 3 readings: 1:20, 4:3b, 4:5b. On the other hand, he fails to note Greek support for 2 readings (1:23 and 1:30), misreads 2 readings (at 1:22 P^{46} has ειτε cum D* 460; at 3:12 P^{46} has the majority reading), and he separates 3:3 into 2 readings. So we have only 38 singulars here. (Kenyon also misreads 1:15, which is supported by 1245.)

Colossians: Kenyon's table has 19 singulars and 9 errors, but his apparatus has 24. He overlooks 3 readings (1:7a, 1:20a, 3:16a [cf. *Pauline Epistles, Plates*, p. i]), and misreads 1:23a as being the same as 33. He also counts 3:6 as one reading where we count two. On the other hand, he misses Greek support for 3 readings: 1:12, 1:20b, 1:22b. And he misreads 2 readings (1:24 where P^{46} has εν [cf. *ibid*., p. i], and 2:11 where P^{46} has the majority reading). So we have 24 readings here. (Kenyon also misreads 4:11b, but this is supported by 1739.)

1 Thessalonians: Kenyon has no table for this book, but his apparatus gives 3. However, 1:9 seems highly uncertain. So we have only 2 singulars here.

These differences are somewhat misleading, since Kenyon does not "include differences in spelling" (*Pauline*

Epistles, Text, p. xv), or at any rate does not do so regularly (see his note ad Ro 9:11: "αλ] sic pro αλλ (et sic saepe)"). His apparatus is, he says, "based almost wholly upon that of Tischendorf, with a very few corrections" (*ibid.*, p. xv). But he does not in fact always read Tischendorf correctly or, it seems, consult the corrections found in Gregory's *Prolegomena*. By the way, it may be of some interest that Kenyon's errors at Ro 11:15, 12:8; He 6:11; Col 1:24, 2:11, are also found in Sanders' edition, who seems to have known of the Chester Beatty leaves only from Kenyon's transcription (cf. *Codex*, p. vii). Indeed, the errors at Ro 11:15 and Col 1:24, 2:11, are first found in Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Vol. III: *Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1934).

[18] The pattern of corrections is as follows:

	possibly man 1	man 1	man 2	man 3	man 4		total
Ro	7	2	2	3	0		14
He	26	13	33	4	0		76
1 Cor	11	12	4	2	1	(+1 ?)	31
2 Cor	7	2	2	1(?)	1		13
Eph	6	1	0	0	0		7
Ga	4	3	1	0	0		8
Php	5	1	1	0	0		7
Col	2	0	1	0	1		4
Totals	68	34	44	10	3	(+1 ?)	160

The doubtful case in 1 Cor is 6:14, where it is not clear whether the first or second hand made the first correction. (I have counted two corrections here in any case.) It is evident that the activity of man 2 was given mostly to Hebrews; indeed, more than half of all the corrections by later hands are by man 2 in Hebrews.

---

[19] *Text*, pp. 252-62. As Zuntz notes (p. 252 n. 3), Kenyon *regularly* distinguishes a first hand and a second hand, but does not discuss the nature of the corrections other than to say: "The occasional corrections in a second hand are too small to assist the dating" (*Pauline Epistles, Text*, p. xv). As Zuntz also notes, Sanders (*in Codex*) refers to man 1, man 2, and man 3, but does not *account* for these distinctions.

[20] Zuntz, *Text*, p. 253.

[21] *Ibid*., pp. 253-54.

[22] *Ibid*., p. 253 n. 3.

[23] He may have temporarily leaped back to (βουλημα)τι αυτου in vs. 19.

[24] Both Kenyon and Sanders ascribe the deletion of σχεδον to the second hand. However, there appears to be no feature of the dots above this word which would justify such an ascription. Indeed, even if the dots *were* in a different colored ink, one could hardly infer with confidence that the scribe could not have written them.

[25] Kenyon says of this correction: "corr. m. 2 (?)." Of course, the initial error could just be the result of harmonization to the immediate context (namely, vs. 7); note that in vs. 7, 33 999 1739 make the reverse substitution.

[26] As mentioned above in note 17, Kenyon edits this reading incorrectly. Sanders attributes the correction to the first hand.

[27] Kenyon's transcription (ε⟦ν̇⟧χων) fails to make clear what has occurred here.

[28] Kenyon edits ιφθαε and says in his apparatus: "ιφθαε, sic pro ιεφθαε." But the plate clearly shows that the scribe first wrote ιεθαε, and then added φ (compare the φ with that in the next line).

[29] Both Kenyon and Sanders ascribe the last two deletions here to the second hand, but the plates here (as in other places) give no justification for such a claim (see note 24 above).

[30] Kenyon says of both 13:8 and 13:9: "add m. 2 ut vid." However, Zuntz (*Text*, p. 252 n. 4) cites Roberts as ascribing these additions to "man. 1," and says that he himself is "not sure" who made the additions. One may judge from this situation how certain the ascription of dots might be.

[31] Kenyon ascribes this to the second hand, but Zuntz (*ibid*.) says he is "not sure" who added the article.

[32] My confidence in the ability of the editors to identify accurately which hands have made the corrections is lessened as a result of some of the discrepancies cited above (see notes 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, and 31). I may mention further that the correction at He 6:1 is ascribed to the second hand by Sanders, but (correctly, I believe) to the first hand by Zuntz (*ibid*., p. 252 n. 5).

[33] Cf. *ibid*., p. 253.

[34] Kenyon misread the sign marking the addition as ς, and thought that the second hand changed λεγει to λεγεις. Sanders correctly says: "post λεγει superscr ς man 2; non litt vid sed nota ad marg referens."

[35] Zuntz, *Text*, p. 253, n. 8, cites only the last two of these, perhaps because he followed Kenyon at the first.

[36] Kenyon does not cite this, but Zuntz says (*ibid*., p. 256): "Also in Heb. x. 10 the scribe had jibbed, for unknown reasons, and had left it to the corrector to fill in the second half of the word προσφορᾶς." That this correction is by the second hand is clear.

[37] Again Kenyon does not cite this, but Zuntz remarks (*ibid*., p. 253): "At the very end of Hebrews he [the second hand] added the three letters which the scribe, hurrying towards his final flourish, had skipped, . . ." Such carelessness would be unexpected, even for our scribe; but note also the omission at He 13:23, where (apparently) the scribe has corrected (rather imperfectly) his own omission of most of a word.

[38] Zuntz (*Text*, p. 256) says: "The corrector applied to this one word two different corrections--at least I think that they both come from him."

UMI

[39] Zuntz (*ibid.*, p. 257) claims that this reading is a harmonization to the preceding ηγειρεν. This is also the explanation put forward by von Soden and by Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 552. Incidentally, Zuntz (*Text*, p. 257 n. 1) argues that the future found in most witnesses is correct: "The future in the original is guaranteed by the parallel 2 Cor. iv. 14." And Metzger (*Commentary*, p. 552) says: "The context makes the future necessary as the correlative of καταργήσει in ver. 13 (compare also the parallel in 2 Cor 4.14)." However, agreement with both the context and the parallel would seem to count *against* the authenticity of the future.

[40] Zuntz, *Text*, p. 254.

[41] Tischendorf cites the Armenian for the omission, also. Von Soden does classify 1319 (his δ180) as a Western manuscript; see *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1936-37. Zuntz claims that the omission is original (*Text*, p. 257 and p. 118).

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 258

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 259. Of course, the omission here could be simply the result of a scribal leap (αμμ*ος* ... χειλ*ος*).

[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 256-57.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 256: "Probably the aorist was marked in the parent manuscript for change into the perfect. P^{46} failed to write the required form and, on second thoughts, copied also one of the two alterations which his *Vorlage* indicated (he forgot to copy the initial M)."

[46] Tischendorf cites the negative in one passage in Clement. By the way, Kenyon here edits τα εαυτης as the reading of the scribe, τα μη εαυτης as the reading of man 2. Zuntz (*ibid.*, p. 257) follows Kenyon's reading, thus obscuring the connection between P^{46} and B. That P^{46} has το is perfectly clear. (By the way, earlier editions of Nestle-Aland cite P^{46} for τα, but the correct citation is found already in the 25th edition.)

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 259-60. Zuntz says the change is by a "corrector whom I cannot identify." I believe this may be the third hand.

[48] Zuntz does not mention this correction.

[49] Zuntz does not cite this correction.

[50] Again Zuntz does not cite this correction.

[51] Zuntz (*Text*, pp. 257-58) refers to He 8:6, He 12:25 (*ibid*., p. 258), 1 Cor 10:2 (*ibid*., p. 256), 1 Cor 12:20 (*ibid*., p. 259 n. 5), and 1 Cor 15:2 (*ibid*., pp. 254-55). In the cases of He 8:6, He 12:25, and 1 Cor 12:20, the textual relationships do not seem to me to warrant the claim that the shift is from Western to Alexandrian, and in the cases of 1 Cor 10:2 and 15:2 the correction is from a singular reading, although Zuntz does argue that at 1 Cor 15:2 the exemplar of P^{46} contained the reading of D* F G marked as spurious.

[52] See note 5 above, as well as Zuntz, *ibid*., pp. 41-42, 96-100.

[53] *Ibid*., p. 262: "The rejected text almost always is that, *or* includes that, of Western witnesses. The variants put in its place are never characteristically Western; the change is always towards that form of the text which is predominantly represented by B."

[54] Zuntz (*ibid*., p. 259) suggests that we have here in P^{46} an *incomplete* correction, and that the corrector failed to write δε after deleting ουν, which Zuntz sees as arising from the previous line (αποβαλωμεθα ουν). The agreement with ℵ* (Zuntz did not know of 6) is then seen as coincidental.

[55] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 154-62.

[56] *Ibid*., p. 156, where an example of this spelling is cited. See also BDF, §11(1); Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, p. 155, where examples of variation in the New Testament are cited (e.g., Jn 7:13 παρησια B* D L*, Ac 2:29 παρησιας C); and von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, p. 1364 (where it is said that B ℵ D [05] L [019] "mehrfach" have παρησια).

[57] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 155. Note also the corrections in P^{46} at Ro 14:15 and Ga 2:12.

[58] Kenyon, *Pauline Epistles, Text*, p. xiv, notes: "αλ is not infrequently written for αλλ'." See also BDF, §11(2), and Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 155 (where numerous examples of this spelling are given).

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 155-56, where a 6th/7th century example of ελλεγχω is cited. Note also the correction at He 11:1.

[60] BDF, §17; Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 95; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1379-80.

[61] BDF, §17; Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, pp. 93-94; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1377-78.

[62] See the similar cases (such as τετρααρχης) cited in BDF, §124, and von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, p. 1381.

[63] BDF, §14, say that this construction occurs "only in P^{46}"; these three cases are the only ones in the New Testament where aspiration before ενιαυτος could occur.

[64] BDF, §14; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, p. 1363.

[65] The two cases in Galatians are cited in BDF, §14.

[66] BDF, §14. We may note that, in the same sentence, P^{46} is cited as having ουκ ο at 1 Cor 7:12; but F G* also have the non-aspirated form here.

[67] Cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 172-73.

[68] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 318. The confusion in P^{46} was probably facilitated by the ουκ occurring in the next line.

[69] BDF, §19(3), says: "εγ- for εκ- before voiced consonants is more frequent in P^{46} alone." See Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 173-76.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 175. BDF, §19(3), cites only the first case, perhaps because Kenyon fails to note 1 Cor 10:13.

[71] Cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 174. BDF, §19(3), cites A B as agreeing with P^{46} here. However, in fact, neither A (see F. G. Kenyon (ed.), *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V-VIII) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*, Vol. I [London: British Museum, 1909]) nor B supports εγδ- here; both have εκδ-. The error is apparently based on Kenyon's apparatus to P^{46}, where he says: "εγδικος εις οργην cum ABς." But Kenyon is here referring to the word order.

[72] Cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 175. BDF, §19(3), cites P^{13} D* as agreeing with P^{46} at He 12:3. Again the reference seems to come from Kenyon's note: "εγλελυμενοι cum D*P^{13}," although he is here contrasting -λελυμενοι with the -λυομενοι of most manuscripts. And in fact both P^{13} and D* have εκ-. For D* see Tischendorf's apparatus as well as his edition of D: *Codex Claromontanus* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1852). For P^{13} (= *P.Oxy*. IV 657) see Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. IV (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904).

However, BDF is correct in citing (at 19[3]) P^{13} as agreeing with P^{46} at He 12:5c; this is doubtless coincidental agreement. (By the way, P^{13} does not support P^{46} at He 12:5a.)

[73] See Gignac's statement (*Grammar*, p. 111):

> "In the papyri, final -ν is very frequently omitted and frequently added. Movable -ν is used irregularly. Medial nasals are also very frequently omitted and occasionally inserted, especially before stops. In addition, the symbols for nasals are sometimes confused."

[74] *Ibid*., pp. 170-71.

[75] *Ibid*., p. 171; all 4 readings of P^{46} are cited in BDF, §19(4).

[76] Cf. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 75; Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, p. 156; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, p. 1382.

[77] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 118.

[78] *Ibid*., p. 113.

[79] The first reading is before a vowel (*ibid*.), the second reading before a stop (*ibid*.). This addition is discussed in BDF, §372(1).

[80] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 116-17.

[81] *Ibid*., p. 117 (see the last three examples under *b*).

[82] This reading also involves the shift from η to α; if, on the other hand, we suppose that the scribe meant to write "with truth," then we would have (it seems) a nonsense in context reading.

[83] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 111-12.

[84] The finite verb would here be nonsense in context, since a complement is needed for οφειλει. Hoskier, *A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus* P^{46} *(circa 200 A.D.)* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1938), pp. 36-37, comments that this reading "is interesting, and not a mere error of P^{46}, for *aeth* exhibits it." Hoskier goes on to suggest that originally there was also a προσφερειν directly after οφειλει, and then later came προσφερει, as in P^{46}. Of course, such a hypothesis is not to the point on the question of whether the reading of P^{46} here makes grammatical sense, and in fact it does not. Moreover, this could be an error even if eth also has it. But eth actually does not quite have this reading. For the οφειλει in Greek which takes an infinitive complement is translated by ረትዐ in Ethiopic, which may take the subjunctive as a complement (as, e.g., also in Jn 19:7; Ro 15:1; 2 Th 1:3; He 2:17) as well as an infinitive complement. Cf. August Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae* (New York: Ungar, 1955 [reprint of the 1865 edition]), cols. 290-91, where we find the meaning: "*decet*, *convenit*, *par est*, *oportet* sive seq. Inf. . . . sive seq. Subj. . . ." At col. 291 the last three parallels mentioned earlier are cited under the equivalent ὀφειλειν.

[85] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 112.

[86] The reverse error is cited *ibid*., p. 113.

[87] This is just a haplography, and in *scriptio continua* it is unclear whether the final ν or the initial ν has been omitted. Gignac, *ibid*., p. 112, cites "ἄλλω (for ἄλλων) νομῶν" from A.D. 151.

[88] *Ibid*.

[89] *Ibid*., p. 120.

[90] *Ibid*., pp. 124-25.

[91] *Ibid*., p. 125.

[92] *Ibid*., pp. 125-26.

[93] Here the addition may have been occasioned by the preceding and following words, which both end in -ς.

[94] The following word here ends in -ς.

[95] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 131.

[96] *Ibid*.

[97] He 10:36 could be accusative for genitive, 2 Cor 7:1b and 7:8 could be genitive for accusative, and He 12:14c, 2 Cor 7:11b, and Php 2:25 could be nominative for accusative.

[98] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 132.

[99] *Ibid*.

[100] Here the two preceding words end in -ς.

[101] Here the preceding word ends in -ς.

[102] This probably results from Coptic influence. Cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 64: "The frequent unconditioned interchange of γ and δ with κ and τ respectively indicates the identification of the voiced and voiceless phonemes originally represented by these symbols in a single velar /k/ and dental /t/ phoneme in the speech of many writers. This was the result of bilingual interference from the Egyptian language in which there were only voiceless stop phonemes."

[103] These two are examples of intervocalic interchange; see *ibid*., pp. 82-83. Although δεκαδας is, of course, a word, I suppose that it gives nonsense in context here. Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 40) says: "It is either an error, or, in the original draft [of Hebrews] there may have been a play as between these two words, meaning decads (of men)

and tithes (of things). Or, it may again reveal an Egyptian background, for δ and τ are readily exchangeable in Coptic."

[104] This is again an example of intervocalic interchange; see Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 82-83.

[105] *Ibid*., p. 92. This interchange may again be a result of influence from Coptic; see *ibid*., p. 95.

[106] Ibid., p. 87. Note the close parallels cited by Gignac: three cases of -σται for -σθαι. Again we may have Coptic influence; see *ibid*., p. 95.

[107] Hoskier's remark (*A Commentary*, p. 51) on this reading is worth quoting in full:

> "κατηρτισται is read by P^{46}, followed by the Coptic and Syriac versions and by the English translations, but the Greek of the rest: κατηρτισθαι--from which I have found no other variation--is adopted by the Latin: 'aptata esse'. As P^{46} favors *theta* generally for *tau* in many places elsewhere (ουθ etc.), this reading of κατηρτισται must be considered as quite beyond question here."

Several points need clarification here. First, the support of the Coptic and Syriac versions is illusory. Both Coptic and Syriac indeed have finite forms instead of the infinitive, but they *also* have a conjunction which makes such a construction grammatical. In Syriac the "we understand" is followed by ܕ, and in Coptic by ϫⲉ. (See Horner's edition of the Bohairic, Vol. III, p. 528; in his edition of the Sahidic, Vol. V, p. 92, he writes ⲉⲛⲛⲟⲉⲓ [ϫⲉ] . . . , but in this edition the first four verses of He 11 contain several such emendations, apparently because they are preserved in only one manuscript: according to the list on pp. 580-84, #22.) Thus, the alternatives are: 1) "we understand" plus infinitive, attested in Greek and Latin; and 2) "we understand" plus subordinating conjunction and finite verb, attested in Syriac and Coptic. P^{46} fits neither of these, and thus has no support from the versions.

Secondly, Hoskier claims that there is some connection between P^{46} on the one hand and Syriac and Coptic on the other, but betrays his case by including English as one of the versions which "followed" the Greek of

P^{46}. He certainly cannot imagine that the relationship between P^{46} and the English could be anything other than coincidental, and in fact the English versions just adopt the second alternative, thus not really agreeing (even coincidentally) with P^{46}. The agreement (if it existed) with Syriac and Coptic could be just as coincidental, but the age of these versions tempted Hoskier into positing a genealogical relation.

Thirdly, Hoskier does not address the problem of construing τους αιωνας with the finite verb. In fact, the reading of P^{46} does produce nonsense (in contrast to the readings of the versions), and so would seem definitely excluded from being the authentic reading. Consequently, the tendency of P^{46} to write ϑ for τ elsewhere (that is, to shift to aspiration) can hardly be sufficient evidence for us to view the reading of P^{46} here as significant.

[108] See BDF, §33, and Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 92. Note also βαραχ at He 11:32a, to be discussed later.

[109] Cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 322, and for the New Testament: BDF, §18; Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, pp. 96-97; von Soden, *Die Schriften, Untersuchungen*, pp. 1380-81; Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, pp. 152-53.

[110] See the passages cited in the preceding note.

[111] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 275, notes that this interchange "occurs very frequently in all phonetic conditions throughout the Roman and Byzantine periods."

[112] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

[113] Three examples of this variation are cited *ibid*.

[114] *Ibid.*, pp. 276-77.

[115] Gignac, *ibid.*, p. 276, cites two examples of this variation, adding "etc."

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 210.

[117] *Ibid.*, p. 300.

[118] *Ibid.*, pp. 211-12.

[119] *Ibid.*, pp. 286-87.

[120] Cf. μετοξυ which occurs frequently (*ibid.*, p. 287).

[121] *Ibid.*, p. 275.

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 293.

[123] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

[124] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

[125] *Ibid.*, p. 283.

[126] *Ibid.*, p. 286.

[127] This reading also involves loss of ν; see note 82.

[128] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 286, where, though, no example of the interchange in this direction is given (the interchange in general is said to be "sporadic"). The scribe has doubtless been influenced by the η which ends the preceding word and begins the following word.

[129] *Ibid.*, p. 195; note especially ημεραις for ημερας twice in the examples.

[130] *Ibid.*, p. 256.

[131] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

[132] *Ibid.*, pp. 295-98, and especially p. 297, where a third-century example of επικες is cited. This "new Hellenistic contraction" is discussed in BDF, §31(2), where the reading of P^{46} is noted.

[133] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 240-41. I suppose that the reading of P^{46} comes from that of D* F G pc. Otherwise, the reading of P^{46} would have come from the majority reading by anaptyxis (*ibid.*, pp. 311-12).

[134] *Ibid.*, pp. 237-38. Kenyon prints φι̣λ̣ει here, but φη̣λ̣ε̣ι appears certain.

[135] *Ibid.*, pp. 242-43, where examples of this shift after a nasal and before σ are cited; 2 Cor 9:9 fits both categories.

[136] *Ibid.*, p. 228. There are several examples cited of εου for ευου, as in He 11:15a.

[137] Ibid., pp. 320-21.

[138] Ibid., pp. 319-20.

[139] All of these might be viewed as nonsense readings; however, for loss of α between consonants see ibid., pp. 306-7, and for loss of α after a vowel see ibid., pp. 304-5. (In connection with 1 Cor 15:10b, note that κοπιζω is cited in LSJ; but this word would not fit the context in 1 Cor, and so would be a nonsense reading.)

[140] Gignac, Grammar, pp. 302-3. For Ga 3:10b note especially the example of βιβλον for βιβλιον cited at the bottom of p. 303.

[141] Ibid., pp. 306-9. In each of the three cases we have a loss between consonants, although in the last example (γαρ τι for γαρ οτι) one might well consider that the scribe has produced nonsense.

[142] Here we probably have an internal dittography caused by a leap back from the second o to the first.

caused

[143] This reading is called by Zuntz (Text, p. 18) "about the most foolish thing he [the scribe] did." Later he (p. 253 n. 7) comments as follows on this error:

> "Was the scribe used to Latin P and mixed it up with Greek P? He uses a Ƶ which could be mistaken for Σ, and the initial I of IϵPϵYC could be swallowed up into the final iota of the preceding ϵI. Thus one might account for this error mirus."

This scenario is possible, it seems, and the scribe certainly makes errors frequently enough that multiple errors within one word may have occurred. However, there appears to be no other evidence that our scribe was in any way influenced by Latin. Furthermore, the scribe's manner of writing Ƶ and c seems to me to be sufficiently clear, and no other example of confusion is found. Finally, although ξυν is sometimes found for συν in the papyri (see Gignac, Grammar, p. 139 and n. 2), there seems to be no interchange of ξ and σ which would furnish a parallel to P^{46}'s reading; cf. Gignac, ibid., p. 141 n. 3, who says in reference to one case of replacement of ξ by ζ: "No parallel interchange of ξ and σ . . . is found in Rom. and Byz. papp."

All of this is to say that we truly have here an *error mirus*.

Hoskier, however, devotes several pages (*A Commentary*, pp. 3-6) to the effort to show that this reading "cannot be a mistake" (p. 5), and that the word used by P^{46} here "means something" (p. 6). In fact, Hoskier argues that P^{46} here preserves the word which the author of the book wished to use for priests, but which was eventually replaced by the usual word ιερευς in the other witnesses to 5:6 and in all witnesses elsewhere. Hoskier claims (pp. 5-6):

> "*Me judice* it [επευξ] represents a trace of what the French call the 'brouillon'--the original rough draft--of the Epistle, and thus brings us very close to the Author (or to the coterie of joint-authors) while the Epistle was 'in process'. . . .
>
> "Evidently, in Paul's time and after his death, the priesthood of Salem and elsewhere was in its decline, and, when the Epistle to the Hebrews was composed and drafted, a question arose as to whether to use ἱερεύς or not. Paul himself had eschewed it. . . . in Barnabas's and in Paul's time a discussion must have been going on as to the *name* of priests and cohens, which actually resulted in cancelling ἱερεύς from Paul's vocabulary . . . .
>
> "A Jew, then, groping for an alternative modernism for priests, had only λειτουργός . . . , which occurs eleven times in the Septuagint, and evidently ἔπευξ means a precentor, leader of prayer and praise and song."

Hoskier was led to this meaning for the unknown word in the following way (pp. 4-5):

> "The Lexicon gives us ἐπευχή 'a prayer', ἐπευκτός, adjectival (as above in Jeremiah [20:14]), and ἐπευκτέος [Hoskier notes that he cannot verify Liddell and Scott's reference to Clement for this word; LSJ cites only ἐπευκταῖος from a papyrus] . . . , but not ἔπευξ (apparently formed on the analogy of an *Eparch* or perhaps of κήρυξ, πέλυξ, and πτέρυξ: a wing, so

largely used in connexion with the Cherubim)."

All of this appears improbable enough. In the first place, Hoskier hardly gives a satisfying explanation of the meaning of επευξ; one would rather expect επευχετης or επευχευς. (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §864, does not include, as far as I can see, any way in which -ευξ would appear; LSJ cites Eustathius for ευχετης.) Secondly, though, and more importantly, Hoskier does not provide any explanation of how this word which was supposedly used throughout Hebrews disappeared except for this one trace in P^{46}. In fact, the theory that it was revised out of the text founders at once on the fact that it is, as Hoskier notes, the first occurrence of the word (for ιερευς) which survives in P^{46}. One can easily imagine an incomplete revision, but surely the first occurrence is the most likely one to catch the revisor's eye. Indeed, it is known that correctors did their work more carefully at the beginning of documents (see note 18 above and Chapter II, note 29).

Hoskier's entire theory appears, therefore, to have been devised to save the scribe of P^{46} from any imputation of simple (or even not so simple) error. We will see yet further examples of this tendency in Hoskier.

[144] This confusion was clearly occasioned by the following θεμελιον. Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 38) comments:

> "This θεμελιοτητα of P^{46} may be an error from the propinquity of θεμελιον, and does not seem possible language, unless the scribe thought it meant "let us 'carry on' upon this foundation"."

Even if the scribe thought this, the reading still does not seem to be possible language. (LSJ does cite, by the way, ο θεμελιωτης from *Gloss*.) Zuntz (*Text*, p. 18 n. 1) remarks that D* (partially supported by Hilary) reads δικαιων τεθεμελιωμενων (for τετελειωμενων) at He 12:23. This is not nonsense, but doubtless arose from the influence of He 1:10, 11:10, or even 6:1.

[145] Kenyon prints ενχηλη, while Nestle-Aland cites: ενχ[.]λη P$^{46\text{vid}}$. (It is difficult to understand the function of "vid" here; there can be no doubt about the

letters printed by Nestle-Aland.) Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 58) says: "The photo, owing to a crease, almost exhibits ϵΝχολΗ . . . ." It is, in fact, barely possible that P^{46} does have ο here, although I believe that η or ι is rather more likely. By the way, Katz has argued that εν χολη is the authentic reading at He 12:15; cf. BDF, §165 and the references therein, as well as Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, Meyers Kommentar, Vol. XIII (12th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 454 n. 1 (-p. 455).

[146] This figure is somewhat arbitrary, since there are so many readings in P^{46} where deciding what counts as "nonsense" as opposed to just "bad sense" is not easy. One reading, for example, which I initially classified as "nonsense in context" was 1 Cor 13:5, where P^{46} has Paul say that love ουκ ευσχημονει. But Albert Debrunner, "Über einige Lesarten der Chester Beatty Papyri des Neuen Testaments," *Coniectanea neotestamentica*, 11 (1947), pp. 37-41, argues that this is a possible reading, and indeed probably the authentic reading.

[147] As does P. Benoit, "Le Codex paulinien Chester Beatty," *Revue biblique*, 46 (1937), p. 61: "Et parfois on se demande si le copiste sait bien le grec?"

[148] Even Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 60) concedes: "This must be an error." It is remarkable that BDF, §474(5c) makes the identical shift to αποστρεφομενον (but without deleting οι).

[149] P^{46}'s reading is said by BDF, §446, to be "spurious." Perhaps the scribe recalled Ro 6:16, where ητοι does occur.

[150] This obvious misreading is so accounted for by Kenyon and Nestle-Aland, as well as by Benoit ("Le Codex," p. 65, where "IX,23" should be "IX,3") and by Frank W. Beare, "The Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in P^{46}," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 63 (1944), p. 382. Zuntz (*Text*, p. 18) concurs, and both he (*ibid*., p. 19) and Benoit ("Le Codex," p. 65) relate the error here with the similar replacement at He 10:14; Zuntz says that the scribe at the latter text misread αγια as ανα, and then inserted σω "in order to make sense of" αναζομενους. The confusion of ΓΙ and Ν appears clear enough, and Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 57, cites the similar confusion of ΤΙ and Π.

Hoskier, however, devotes an extraordinary amount of attention to the reading at 9:3b. He also suggests that P^{46} is correct at 10:14, and that the *other* scribes have made the reverse confusion (*A Commentary*, pp. 27-29). But the treatment of 9:3b is truly remarkable. Instead of concluding that P^{46} has made a simple blunder (*ibid*., p. 7: "I cannot believe it. There must be some explanation. It is too easy to say that ανα is a mere error for αγια."), Hoskier presents an elaborate defense of the reading of P^{46}, relating it to the Hebrew אנא, the Egyptian ānχ, and the Sanskrit AN (see *ibid*., pp. 7-8, 8-11, and 27). The entire discussion can be found on pp. 6-28 and 71-74, but I find only two points that are close to being arguments for the reading of P^{46}.

The first (p. 27) is: "Any critic who wishes to insist that ανα in Heb. ix.3 is an error for αγια αγιων must account for the fact that no corrector or reader of our papyrus has touched it or questioned it." However, such a challenge would be persuasive only if there was some evidence of systematic and careful revision of P^{46}, and there is no such evidence. (Why has no corrector touched all the other errors?) In fact, the failure of anyone to correct this reading is strong evidence that there was no careful revision, for we know that other readings at 9:3 were present throughout the tradition, and thus a careful reviser or reader would surely have altered the reading of P^{46} to αγια αγιων or some other currect reading.

Hoskier's second point (p. 28) is: "we cannot summarily dismiss ανα as a mere error for αγια, since αγιων is lacking." It is interesting that P^{46} omits the second word, too, but omissions are, as we shall see below, too frequent in P^{46} for this one to be especially troublesome. I suspect, in fact, that this omission (He 9:3c) is the result of the scribe's thinking that the first tent was the αγια αγιων (which P^{46} reads at 9:2 with A D*; the others omit αγιων), but the second, requiring a different designation, was the αγια.

In any case, we adopt the "too easy" route of dismissing the reading of P^{46} at He 9:3b as a nonsense in context reading caused by a visual lapse.

[151] Zuntz (*Text*, p. 18) calls this a "typical uncial error," which *then* "caused also the ending of the following noun to be altered."

[152] Zuntz (*ibid.*) cites this as one of P^{46}'s worst errors.

[153] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 44) says: "'Supporting' is a possible reading for 'overshadowing', . . ." But I can find no justification for thinking that κατασκευαζον could mean "supporting."

[154] Sanders, *Codex*, p. 37, notes: "This is a good example of a pure scribal error. The eye of the scribe jumped from χ in πτωχά to χ in στοιχῖα and omitted the intervening letters." We should thus postulate that P^{46} saw here the itacistic spelling στοιχια. This spelling is mentioned by Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, pp. 161-62, and von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, p. 1370. However, P^{46} reads στοιχεια at the other two extant occurrences of the word: He 5:12, Ga 4:3.

[155] See note 36 above.

[156] See note 37 above. Of course, υ could be an itacistic spelling of οι, and so is not strictly nonsense; cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 197.

[157] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 49) says: "This looks like an early draft [of Hebrews]--εθος τι--in parenthesis, as it were." But such an understanding seems very harsh indeed.

[158] P^{46} also adds εν (sensically) at 1 Cor 14:19a and 2 Cor 9:2b.

[159] Sanders, *Codex*, p. 36, says: "This is another instance where the scribe of P^{46} misunderstood the correction in the parent manuscript and so copied οὐκ in both positions." Zuntz, *Text*, p. 255 n. 4, suggests the same cause of the error. However, there is no support (except P^{46}) for placing ουκ before εις, and so the existence of such a reading appears problematical. It might be that our scribe leaped from ος to υμας, then wrote ουκ, caught his mistake, backed up, and then wrote εις υμας ουκ, but failed to delete the first ουκ. As Zuntz points out (*ibid.*, p. 255) P^{46} probably made a similar duplication of negatives at 1 Cor 15:51 (agreeing with A^{c}); however, there is ancient evidence for each of the two positions of ου, and so here it is reasonable to suppose that P^{46}'s conflation arose from a correction in his exemplar.

[160] As may have been the case with 2 Cor 13:3 (see the preceding note), this duplication of μου may have arisen from an initial leap (εορακαν . . . προσωπον), followed by writing μου, then catching the error and writing the omitted words followed by μου again, but failing to correct the initial mistake. Such examples make clear that the scribe proceeded with little care.

[161] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 59) says that this reading "can be neglected."

[162] This is a curious case. Kenyon prints π̅α̅ρ̅ι̅, and says in his apparatus: "πατρι] compendium insolitum vel confusum." In fact, the final letter has clearly been *deleted* (by a slash), and so we are supposed to read π̅α̅ρ̅, presumably for πατηρ.

[163] BDF, §51(2), classifies this reading under "mere inadvertences," and Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (Durchgesehener Nachdruck der fünften Auflage; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), *s.* πλατος, says it is a "Versehen." On the other hand, Hoskier ("A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 38 [1937], p. 150) raises a question as to whether this is really an error. However, his argument is, at best, irrelevant to this particular reading, since he cites 1 Clem 13:1 as making τυφος neuter instead of masculine, and then goes on to discuss the gender of πλουτος in the New Testament. Indeed, his comments concerning this latter word have the effect, I believe, of undermining our confidence in P^{46}. For Hoskier cites the manuscript evidence for the gender of πλουτος, and then says (pp. 150-51): "it will be seen that *pap*^{46} is easily the most consistent witness." Hoskier then comments that "roughnesses" were probably present in the original text, and that "all the attempted polishing, and the harmonizing for consistency's sake, took place later" (p. 151). This is perhaps reasonable, but if consistency comes later, then P^{46}, the most consistent witness on the gender of πλουτος, is surely condemned as reflecting a development later than that present in the other, less consistent witnesses.

UMI

[164] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 30) grants that ανιστασθαι "may be considered awkward after the preceding ει," but then goes on to note that ει is not present in the Ethiopic, Syriac, English, and German versions. However, in none of these do we find the reading of P^{46} with ει. Hoskier further notes that Herodotus uses ει plus an infinitive in *oratio obliqua*, but this use is (according to LSJ, *s.* ει, B.IV) peculiar to Herodotus, and should hardly be invoked to save our scribe from a blunder. (LSJ, *s.* ει, A.2.a, also notes that ει plus an infinitive occurs twice in the *Odyssey* for wishes.)

[165] One passive use of περιπατεω is noted from Apollonius Dyscolus in LSJ, but this doesn't fit Ga 5:16.

[166] Kenyon reads [εν ε]θ̣[ε]λοενθρησκεια, but the space seems inadequate for the first εν. I believe that the scribe was puzzled by the word εθελοθρησκια (which first occurs here at Col 2:23; see Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*), and so attempted an improvement by rewriting the phrase as: εθελο (for εθελω) εν θρησκεια. Cf. also BDF, §118(2), where the formation found in Kenyon is called "incorrect."

[167] See, e.g., notes 82, 97, 103, 107, 139, and 141 above.

[168] "A Study," p. 153. The example Hoskier goes on to cite, 1 Cor 1:24, is one which is perhaps possible. However, other cases (see 2 Cor 7:11b and Php 2:25 [cf. note 97 above]) would require extremely brief plunges into anacoluthon, even for Paul.

[169] Cf. e.g., BDF, §§465-69.

[170] *A Commentary*, p. 42.

[171] See notes 143 and 150 above.

[172] See notes 84, 107, and 164 above.

[173] E.g., He 8:5b, 12:10c.

[174] *A Commentary*, p. 42 n. §.

[175] R. V. G. Tasker, "The Text of the 'Corpus Paulinum,'" *New Testament Studies*, 1 (1954-55), p. 183.

[176] Zuntz, *Text*, p. 18. Actually, even Zuntz does not fully present the extent of error in P^{46}, since he gives only samples of the readings, and thus makes it more plausible than I believe to be the case that some of the singulars of P^{46} should be trusted. This problem is made clear when Zuntz, after mentioning 43 errors (pp. 18-20) as well as He 10:1a (pp. 20-23; Zuntz views this reading as a conjecture), claims that he has "surveyed such features which tend to discourage the student's confidence" in "readings attested by P^{46} alone" (p. 23), and then goes on to look at readings which demonstrate a "unique quality of text" (p. 23). Some of these readings will be discussed in detail below.

[177] Note that at Col 1:12 P^{46} B alone add αμα after ευχαριστουντες. Metzger (*Commentary*, p. 620) says: "The agreement of P^{46} and B in prefixing ἅμα is a noteworthy coincidence in error." But Zuntz (*Text*, p. 40) is surely right in seeing this agreement and a few others as establishing "some close relationship between the papyrus and B."

[178] Benoit ("Le Codex," p. 62) notes: "Dans *Heb*. encore (V, 6, 10; VII, 17, 21) la citation de *Ps*. CIX, 4 [in the LXX] a été regulièrement munie d'un εἶ: σὺ εἶ ἱερεύς, contre tous les autres mss. (ou à peu près), sans doute pour mieux reproduire le texte des LXX dans ℵ."

[179] Benoit (*ibid*., p. 63) says: "nous n'avons relevé qu'*une seule répétition*: *Phil*. IV, 6." This is actually one of the four dittographies which give nonsense: Ro 8:38; 2 Cor 3:11; Php 2:18, 4:6. So P^{46} contains a total of six dittographies.

[180] Even Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 53) accepts this as an error: "It is, no doubt, supposed to balance the second και."

[181] This addition of οτι *recitativum* is taken, it seems, as authentic by Blass-Debrunner (BDF, §470[1]; note that πῶς is incorrectly written here for ὥς). Sanders (*Codex*, p. 20) claims that the reading "probably arose from a correction and both particles were copied, though Mayser, II, 3, 44 notes ὡς ὅτι as a rare combination." I believe that a more likely explanation is that the scribe, noting that ως could be taken either as part

of the quotation or as introducing the quotation (i.e., taking ως as equal to οτι; cf. Bauer, Wörterbuch, s. ως IV.4), resolved the ambiguity (correctly) by inserting οτι.

[182] Hoskier ("A Study," p. 155) refers to "this style" exhibited at these two readings in P^{46}, and claims that the first is supported by the Syriac. But in fact the Syriac expands the Greek τω ιδιω κυριω στηκει η πιπτει into the balanced:

ܐܢ ܩܐܡ ܠܡܪܗ ܩܐܡ ܐܘ ܢܦܠ ܠܡܪܗ ܢܦܠ.

So the support of the Syriac for the addition in P^{46} is surely coincidental: P^{46} balances the conjunctions, the Syriac balances the entire construction.

[183] Zuntz (Text, p. 19) says that this δη "has quite an Attic ring but is against the usage of Paul and indeed of the New Testament generally." BDF, §451(4), says that δη in the New Testament "is used in accordance with classical usage in sentences containing a command or exhortation (and apparently takes P^{46} to be correct at 1 Cor 15:49; note that P^{46} reads, with most manuscripts, φορεσωμεν before δη). The only place where Paul uses δη is 1 Cor 6:20; cf. Zuntz, Text, pp. 169, 190-91.

[184] Zuntz (Text, p. 108 n. 6) says of the article here: "The latter is most probably a faulty addition by the scribe. It is, however, just possible that it is a relic of ΕΡΓω misread; cf. for example, ΜΕΝ for ΕϹΜΕΝ in Heb. iii. 6."

[185] This use of the article and indefinite pronoun together is noted by Smyth, Grammar, §1267.

[186] Hoskier (A Commentary, p. 40) says that this addition is "a 'roughness' (or a syriasm) since removed, if ω belongs at the end of the previous line (mutilated)." There is, however, no reason to suppose that ω was absent from P^{46}, for the pronoun αυτω would, in the presence of ω, constitute a pleonastic pronoun (see BDF, §297), whose addition is explained by Gn 14:20. By the way, the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland cites syr^{p} as supporting P^{46}'s παντος αυτω (παντος agrees with B). But ܘܠܗ just renders ω και, and ܟܠܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܥܡܗ hardly corresponds to παντος αυτω. Since the meaning is

literally "everything which was with him [Abraham]," the relative clause does not render αυτω, and should be seen as an example of the Syriac fondness for possessive pronouns; cf. Sebastian P. Brock's comments in Metzger, Early Versions, pp. 95-96. Moreover, ܟܠܗܘܢ does not imply the singular in Greek; see, for example, 1 Tm 2:1, Jas 5:12, and 1 Pe 4:8, where ܟܠܗܘܢ translates παντων (in all manuscripts; at the first text F G omit).

[187] Zuntz (Text, p. 19) calls this addition "absurd."

[188] Zuntz (ibid., p. 230 n. 3) claims that the reading of F G (λαληομεν τω νοι μου for τω νοι μου λαλησαι) arose from that of P^{46}. The λαλησαι was transposed (Zuntz does not explain this) so that ΛΑΛΗCΑΙΕΝ was found before τω. Then, ϹAI was misread as OM. Zuntz, by the way, believes that the Byzantine reading is authentic.

[189] Here εν appears to be used for the regular dative (as is sometimes the case: BDF, §220[1]). Perhaps the earlier εν ταις εκκλησιαις [-ιας P^{46}] της μακεδονιας of 2 Cor 8:1 was an incentive for the addition in 9:2.

[190] Sanders (Codex, p. 36) says of 2 Cor 10:8:

> "This doublette in P^{46} probably indicates that corrections were being made in the manuscripts before the time of the recensions. In the parent of P^{46} καυχησωμαι, which has Western and Antiochian support, stood in the text. Later someone had written above it καυχησομαι, which was then copied into P^{46}. The second reading became popular in Egypt and was adopted for the Alexandrian recension."

Sanders also (ibid.) refers to P^{46}'s nonsense reading at 2 Cor 13:3; but see note 159 above.

[191] Text, pp. 254-56. Zuntz says that the scribe "unblushingly" produced the conflation at 2 Cor 10:8, and also refers to the conflation at 1 Cor 15:51 (where P^{46} agrees with A^c; see note 159 above). Zuntz also claims that a correction in P^{46}'s Vorlage accounts for the text at 1 Cor 15:2, where P^{46} left a blank space after υμειν, and κατεχειν (before ει κατεχετε) has been deleted (by dots). However, the reading of P^{46} here just agrees with the majority of manuscripts.

[192] Metzger (*Commentary*, p. 611) says of Php 1:11:

> "Very remarkable is the reading καὶ ἔπαινόν μοι (F^{gr} G it^{g}), which has no parallel in Paul, and still more astonishing is the early conflate reading in P^{46}, θεοῦ καὶ ἔπαινον ἐμοί."

On the other hand, J. K. Elliott, "Plaidoyer pour un éclectisme intégral appliqué à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament," *Revue biblique*, 84 (1977), p. 25, comments:

> "On se sert utilement d'une autre règle empirique: si les leçons données par un lot de variantes peuvent toutes s'expliquer par dérivation, à l'exception d'une seule, celle-ci est vraisemblablement originale. Par exemple, en *Phil*., I, 11, les possessifs après «gloire» et «promesse» [*sic*] peuvent tirer leur origine de la leçon de P^{46}."

Of course, a conflated reading may always be the source of its parts by independent simplification. But, once we observe this pattern of conflation in P^{46}, there is surely no reason to believe that P^{46} is original at any of these readings.

[193] Benoit ("Le Codex," p. 63 n. 3) calls this reading in P^{46} a "curieux mélange" of the other two primary readings.

[194] Benoit, "Le Codex," pp. 62-63. The examples which Benoit cites of P^{46}'s preference for simple forms will be noted later on. But one case may be mentioned here: 1 Cor 7:13, where P^{46} B 81 1881* 2464 pc read ευδοκει for συνευδοκει (*ibid*., p. 63; note that prior to the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland only P^{46} B were known for this reading). In 7:12 all manuscripts read συνευδοκει (except for P^{46}'s συνευδοκια, which presupposes the prefix), and Zuntz (*Text*, p. 40) believes that P^{46} B are correct in vs. 13, thus making a distinction between the man and the woman. And Zuntz adds a criticism of Benoit (*Text*, p. 40 n. 5):

> "P. Benoit (loc. laud. 63) compares this variant [7:13] with others intimating a *goût des leçons plus*

> courtes of P⁴⁶ (each time, though, in different company). If this tendency operated in ver. 13, why not in ver. 12?"

The same question could be asked about many of the omissions of P⁴⁶, or indeed about many of the errors found in any manuscript. But the answer is simply that P⁴⁶ is not undertaking a systematic revision of his text (or, if he is, he does it very badly). Rather, his errors are either accidental (and thus occur at some places and not at others), or they result from partial or temporary efforts at consistency (as our scribe's treatment of the four allusions to Ps 110:4 in Hebrews). A tendency (or *goût*) is not expected to act continuously.

It may be relevant to note here the comment of Kilpatrick in reply to a similar criticism by Martini ("If there was really an atticistic corrector, why did he not correct also the other passages in Acts?"):

> "It is of course tempting to imagine that the transcribers of the New Testament in the second century A.D. went to work as we do today. We have many aids and encouragements to be systematic in editing a text, but the evidence we have is not in favour of the assumption that they were systematic too." ("Eclecticism and Atticism," p. 107)

[195] *Text*, p. 18. Zuntz seems to underestimate the value of *this* discovery in his criticism of Benoit discussed in the preceding note.

[196] Hoskier ("A Study," pp. 162-63) remarks:

> "The notes to the edition of *pap*⁴⁶ indicate a large number of omissions, assumed to be due to homoioteleuton. How far this apparent carelessness invalidates *other* omissions is a grave and pertinent question. I *had* prepared a list of the rarer omissions, but there is no room for it here. It replies very fully to this extremely relevant question, and covers some 260 cases, fully reported, with the evidence in each place.
>
> "I do not suppose that any competent critic will say that these omissions are due to pure chance, for to the long list must be added at least twice or thrice

> as many more, where larger support is forthcoming.
>
> "It is quite true, speaking mathematically--as the N.T. documents have been copied and reproduced so often--that fortuitous mistakes have crept into many manuscripts at the same places. We had cited all the cases, which we could notice, of support from single documents, besides groups, whether fortuitous or not. But this great list is too long for us to question the genuine character of a number of these omissions."

Hoskier does not explain why the length of the list of omissions should cause "a number" of them to be genuine; he is presumably relying on the principle of lectio brevior potior. As he notes, agreement in omission may be due to accidental agreement, or may be traced back to the omission in some common ancestor. If it were in fact incompetent to say that the omissions were due to "pure chance," it would be even more incompetent to say that the additions of the omitted words in the other manuscripts were due to pure chance, and we should be unable to make any judgment at all.

Moreover, the support which Hoskier claims for some of these readings is, as we have seen and will continue to see, unclear or even non-existent. His claims for especially frequent agreement between P^{46} and the Ethiopic alone (or almost alone) are discussed in detail in Appendix B.

[197] Zuntz (Text, p. 19) says that "the omission of whole clauses owing to homoioteleuton is an outstanding characteristic of P^{46}," and cites He 8:8, 8:12, 9:14, and 12:6-7, as well as (in n. 2) 1 Cor 10:28 and 15:40. Benoit ("Le Codex," p. 63) comments: "Les omissions par homoioteleuton sont vraiment fréquentes et parfois considérables," and goes on to cite 16 of our cases and also 1 Cor 1:25 (where P^{46} has support from Ψ 257).

[198] Kenyon supposes that P^{46} has omitted ο ελεων εν ιλαροτητι (in a lacuna), for a loss of 4 words. But I believe that the omission presumed here is more likely.

[199] Zuntz (Text, pp. 32-33) notes that παντα is already present in the citation from Ps 8:7 in He 2:8, and says of the repetition of παντα in the majority text: "The

writer is unlikely to have himself effected this tedious tautology." But several portions of Ps 8:5-7 are taken up in vss. 8-9, and the author of Hebrews often uses what might appear to be "tedious tautology" (as in his repeated allusions to Ps 110:4). Zuntz concludes that "the natural inference seems to be that the original, short text (P^{46}) has been variously interpolated on the model of the preceding and following passages." But such a view places too much weight on P^{46}'s evidence. Beare, "The Text," pp. 385-86, also thinks that P^{46} may be correct here.

[200] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 43) says that "there is a space in the Papyrus between λϵΓϵΙ $\overline{\text{KC}}$ and KAI (CYNTϵλϵCω)..., and it would therefore seem that the exemplar from which it was reproduced also lacked the words." But this is a totally gratuitous assumption, since the space here is very small, and is quite like the small intervals which we find throughout the papyrus, some to mark pauses in sense, some others due to "flaws in the papyrus" (see Kenyon, *Pauline Epistles, Text*, p. xiv). Hoskier follows Kenyon, by the way, in missing the correction of this omission; see note 34 above.

[201] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, pp. 43-44) says that 69 (Scrivener's m, Tischendorf's 37) has the same omission here. But P^{46} has leaped from μεγαλου αυτων to αδικιαις αυτων in the ℵ* B 33 1739 pc text, and thus reads μεγαλου αυτων και των αμαρτιων αυτων ου μη κτλ. On the other hand, 69 has leaped from μεγαλου αυτων to αμαρτιων αυτων in the ϛ pm text, and thus reads μεγαλου αυτων και των ανομιων αυτων ου μη κτλ. So, while both P^{46} and 69 have made an error of homoeoteleuton here, it does not seem to have been quite the *same* error. (For the sake of completeness I mention the unlikely possibility that P^{46} actually made the leap described above within the ϛ pm text, and then immediately made another leap from αμαρτιων αὑτων to ανομιων αυτων. But these two leaps are also not supported by other manuscripts.)

[202] It appears that the leap made by the scribe took place within the text of D*, since the τω between θεω and ζωντι found in P^{46}* is otherwise found only in D*.

[203] This omission is perhaps related to the omission of τι in 8:2 and the omission of υπ αυτου in 8:3 (where P^{46} finds support from א* 33). Zuntz (*Text*, pp. 31-32) argues that the shorter text of P^{46} gives a superior meaning, and concludes:

> "The three omissions are interrelated and support each other. Their combination, in P^{46} only, effects a consistent and uniquely suitable argument. It would be preposterous to ascribe this to a blundering scribe or a clever editor rather than to Paul himself. The gradual agglomeration of additions, on the other hand, is explicable in accordance with the normal features of manuscript tradition. Here again, then, P^{46} appears to be right against all other witnesses. Its consistently shorter text bears the mark of genuineness."

But the so-called additions here appear to be quite within the Pauline spirit, as indeed Zuntz grants in effect when he notes their possible sources. The "addition" of τον θεον is said to come from, e.g., Ro 8:28 (*Text*, p. 32), but this very parallel makes it hard to see how the shorter text at 1 Cor 8:3 is so superior. Similarly, even though the absence of υπ αυτου would fit with 1 Cor 13:12, the presence of the words would be consistent with Paul's statement in Ga 4:9. Thus, the longer text seems to present no difficulties.

I believe that in fact Zuntz is under the influence of the view (as he says at the end of the above passage) that scribes tend to add to the tradition. But, as he has noted himself (see note 197 above), this is not the case for P^{46} (at least). Cf., further, Metzger, *Commentary*, pp. 556-57, for a defense of the longer text.

[204] I assume here that the reading of P^{46} came from the majority text; if it came from that of D* F G pc, the omission of one word may also have been by a leap: γαλακτος αυτης.

[205] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 55) notes that this omission, like that of κατηγωνισαντο in He 11:33, is of 13 letters, and perhaps constituted one line in P^{46}'s *Vorlage*. He also says (without giving examples) that there are other omissions of multiples of 13 letters, e.g., 26 and 39 letters. Of course, the early papyri have made it improbable that P^{46}'s *Vorlage* would have had such short lines (see Metzger, *Text*, p. 162, point 4).

UMI

[206] Metzger (*Commentary*, p. 607) suggests that the reading of P^{46} (and of 1245 2147) arose either through "scribal oversight" or "through the influence of the stereotyped expression (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) in the Gospels." The latter explanation seems to me most likely, especially since I fail to see how the presumed "scribal oversight" would occur.

[207] The general similarity of these two words would have made the leap more likely than this one final letter suggests.

[208] The lines of P^{46} itself contain 23-25 letters at 2 Cor 11:6-7. However, the lines of P^{45} are considerably longer, containing 45-50 letters per line. And P^{47} has lines of about the length of those in P^{46}. A line of 36 letters would thus seem possible for the *Vorlage* of P^{46}, and would explain this otherwise puzzling omission. (By the way, one may note that the reading of A 36 323 1739 pc at Ac 8:39 contains 36 letters more than the usual reading [Nestle-Aland has shortened the reading by 2 letters by a leap: επεπεσεν becomes επεσεν]. Could one line have been omitted here in an early copy?) Cf. note 205 above.

[209] This would be a leap occasioned by the similar sound of ε and αι (and of γ and κ).

[210] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 51) remarks: "The δε seems unnecessary, for here we strike a new and definite paragraph." But most occurrences of δε are "unnecessary," I suppose.

[211] Hoskier (*ibid*., p. 63) suggests that γαρ has been added at several places in Hebrews where P^{46} alone, or nearly alone, preserves the original text by omitting it. Besides He 13:11a, he cites He 4:4, 7:11, 10:26a, and 12:10a. But the omission at 4:4 is purely conjectural, as P^{46} is not extant (cf. *ibid*., p. 36), and at 7:11 P^{46} is supported by 2298. (Note that P^{13} already has the omission at 4:4, and that at 12:10a the omission is corrected by the second hand.)

Hoskier also refers to the following texts where P^{46}'s omission of γαρ is supported: Ro 12:4 (= 1311); 1 Cor 4:15 (= 1), 14:14 (= B F G 0243 1739 pc); Ga 5:6 (= G* pc); and Col 3:24 (= ℵ A B C D* 33 81 1739 pc). He also refers to Ga 6:3, where P^{46} has ειπερ for ει γαρ, but we treat this as a substitution below. And Hoskier correctly cites our other two singular omissions: 1 Cor 9:16, and Ga 3:28c.

Hoskier thus counts 13 cases of omission of γαρ, "without counting omissions of δε, και, ουν, μεν in other places. It would be a rash person who would accuse P^{46} of omitting all these copulas from sheer carelessness, even when alone. It has become clear that far more 'polishing' took place after the original [of Hebrews] was launched than has been supposed hitherto, and P^{46} is absolved from many laches attributed to it."

Hoskier fails to explain why it would be rash to charge P^{46} with carelessness in omission, but not rash to charge the other manuscripts (or a common ancestor) with carelessness in adding (presumably) all these conjunctions.

[212] Again, this leap would have been occasioned by the similar sounds.

[213] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 37) comments on the article here: "Added no doubt to the primary text on revision, unless τα was omitted here from propinquity of the τινα preceding."

[214] On the omission of the article before ιδιος, see BDF, §286(2).

[215] Another possible sound leap.

[216] In uncials, of course, the endings would be quite similar: ЄΠΙΤΗ.

[217] Nestle-Aland cites P^{46} for αυτην προσδεξησθε (cum ς ℵ A pm). But αυτην is surely omitted. Note that the space containing -χραι[αις ινα] is occupied in the preceding line by και δι[ακον], a perfect fit. With αυτην present, 15 letters would have to be squeezed into the space taken up by 9 letters in the preceding line.

[218] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 40) says: "This ος follows ετερος and can have been as easily reduplicated subsequently as omitted originally [i.e., in P^{46}]; the sense remains the same." Hoskier's "as easily" ignores both the external evidence for the pronoun and the clear tendency of P^{46} to omit more often than to add.

[219] This could be an omission of ενι, depending on which reading we presume the *Vorlage* of P^{46} to have had.

[220] BDF, §200, cites this reading as a rare use of the dative without preposition for duration of time. Smyth (*Greek Grammar*, §1542c) says of such a use of the dative: "εν is rarely omitted in prose, and chiefly when there is an attributive."

[221] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 36) says that this omission is made *by* "P^{46} *and* (apparently) *Sod*$^{\text{tres}}$." However, I believe that these three codices (1245 1319 1610) are cited by von Soden for the omission of σημερον pri in He 4:7. For, although his apparatus notes this variant *after* a variant on τοσουτον (which comes between σημερον *pri* and σημερον sec), the omission is connected (by being placed between two vertical lines) with a transposition of ημεραν σημερον, and this can only refer to the *first* σημερον.

[222] Another possible sound leap.

[223] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 36) suggests that P^{46} may be correct in *omitting*, since "ημεραν may easily have been *added*, in a misguided attempt to round off the sentence."

[224] This could well be an omission of two words, of course. For a reason for this omission, see note 150 above.

[225] Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 50) claims that this omission gives a "*shorter and* most graphic expression, which has a decided N.T. literary flavour," and adds that "we *can* do without it [υποστολης], and it may have been *added* on revision.

[226] Hoskier (*ibid.*, p. 65) says of this omission and the longer one at *He* 13:24b: "Probably the double occurrence of παντας is responsible in both these cases."

[227] This is especially the case with some of the longer leaps: e.g., He 9:14, 12:6-7; 2 Cor 1:6-7, 8:19-20.

[228] Besides the 129 omissions of one word, there are 211 words lost in the longer omissions. This figure is somewhat approximate, since the number of words in the *Vorlage* is sometimes doubtful; but the pattern is clear.

[229] Ga 2:9 might also be a transposition, if the reading of P^{46} comes from the D F G text. I believe that it is more likely, though, that P^{46}'s *Vorlage* contained the majority reading, and that P^{46} harmonized to the context by replacing κηφαϲ by πετροϲ, which occurs twice in vss. 7-8.

[230] Nestle-Aland cites P^{46} here as simply omitting τι.

[231] The latter leap would be based on the similar sounds.

[232] The reading of ου for ουϲ here is, as noted above, an orthographic variant.

[233] Cf. P^{46}'s reading at 2 Cor 1:19.

[234] This is a difficult text, but I believe that the simplest hypothesis is that the reading of P^{46} comes from that of $D^{b,c}$. At least $D^{b,c}$ is the only other witness to αλλων πολλων. Of course, it is possible that P^{46} has here conflated the readings found in the Western and Alexandrian witnesses.

[235] Here there are other changes as well besides the transposition.

[236] BDF, §477(1), cites P^{46} as having a chiasmus here: πολλοι εισιν θεοι και κυριοι πολλοι. But this must be accidental, as is also the following chiasmic structure in P^{46}'s reading at 2 Cor 8:7: περισσευετε εν παντι πιστει ... ινα και εν ταυτη τη χαριτι περισσευητε.

[237] The New English Bible follows P^{46} here, but Metzger's explanation that P^{46} has "a much more commonplace sequence" (*Commentary*, p. 565) seems adequate, if indeed any reason other than accident is required.

[238] BDF, §475(2), says that the order in P^{46} here "is impossible." The reading at Ro 11:22 suggests that the scribe had some fondness for placing a particle between article and noun.

[239] Compare the pattern for P^{45}, which has 12 transpositions of more than 4 words (of a total of 47 cases); P^{46} has only 5 (of a total of 37) plus Ro 15:33.

[240] This possibility is mentioned by Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 536.

[241] See the survey of the evidence, *ibid.*, pp. 533-36. Sanders, *Codex*, p. 35, thinks the order in P^{46} is correct, witnessing to the stage when "Chapters I to XV were addressed to the Romans and had a regular ending. Chapter XVI was the covering letter introducing Phoebe to the Ephesians."

[242] At He 10:8 the witnesses are divided and P^{46} is not extant. At He 7:27 most witnesses have the plural, a few have the singular, and P^{46} has a singular omission (He 7:27a).

[243] At Ro 16:5 most witnesses (ς $D^{b,c}$ Ψ pm) have assimilated in the other direction to read απαρχη της αχαιας. P^{46}, though, has ασιας (but for απαρχη reads απ αρχης along with D*).

[244] As discussed earlier, several of the orthographic and nonsense singulars also appear to have been occasioned by the context.

[245] See note 180 above.

[246] See note 189 above.

[247] This is a dittography, and so could be just a mechanical error.

[248] Zuntz (*Text*, p. 19) refers to the addition of πνευματικος here as a "gloss," and Benoit ("Le Codex," p. 66) says that this was added "sans doute à cause du v. 46." But instead of viewing this as an addition to the Alexandrian text (which is certainly possible), I believe that the more likely source lies in confusion over the ς pm reading of ο κ̅ς̅, which could have appeared in context as ανθρωποςοκ̅ς̅. P^{46}, whom we have already seen to have erred frequently regarding contractions for *nomina sacra*, read the last few letters as the -κος of πνευματικος,

aided by the π a few letters before and the memory of the two occurrences of πνευματικον in vs. 46.

Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 568, also claims that the reading of P^{46} "shows the influence of ver. 46." Incidentally, although the United Bible Societies edition gives the Alexandrian reading here an "A" rating, the omission could easily have occurred accidentally by homoeoteleuton. If the above analysis of the error by P^{46} is correct, then P^{46} is also actually a witness to the ς pm reading.

[249]This reading could be yet another example of a misplaced scribe, who began with προς τας in vs. 12, but then lost his place, and returned to these words in vs. 11, continuing then with μεθοδιας. It is clear that our scribe eventually found his position, but did not correct his error.

[250]See note 229 above.

[251]P^{46} certainly also wrote ουκετι for ουκ ενι tert, but the third occurrence is not extant.

[252]Von Soden refers to the subsequent occurrence of ανθρωπος to explain the reading of Marcion. Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 613, explains the reading of P^{46} as "a non-doctrinal conformation to the singular δούλου and the following ἄνθρωπος."

[253]See note 220 above.

[254]See note 150 above.

[255]See note 214 above.

[256]P^{46} reads επικαλεσονται with ς pm in vs. 14a.

[257]Hoskier (*A Commentary*, pp. 38-39) argues that P^{46} is *correct* with the genitive here. He claims that καλον "is a Homeric and classical adverb for καλως," and that the author "doubtless" used it adverbially, so that the meaning of the verse is: "and have well tasted of God's word." Unfortunately, however, the adverbial use of καλον appears to be limited to "poets" (according to LSJ, *s.v.*, C.I), and so one might well doubt whether it should be assumed for Hellenistic prose. Moreover, Hoskier's inter-

pretation would require, as he sees, that δυναμεων follow, rather than the δυναμεις of all manuscripts (P^{46} has, by itacism, δυναμις), and he says: "This is a serious difficulty, although, I suppose, such a rapid transition [from construing γευεσθαι with the genitive to construing it with the accusative, although Hoskier says "nominative"] is possible." Hoskier goes on to hint, it seems, that δυναμεων may have been the original reading anyway, but gives an alternative solution (cf. note 168 above) by invoking anacoluthon, so that we would have: "and enjoyably tasting of God's word, *viz*. (the) power of the coming age." (Hoskier's construction works equally well with δυναμις and δυναμεις.)

All of this seems to be unnecessary in order to account for what can easily be explained as the result of assimilation. Incidentally, γευεσθαι may be construed with either genitive or accusative (see BDF, §169[3], and Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*), but it is interesting that the author of Hebrews shifts from the genitive in 6:4 (as also in 2:9) to the accusative in 6:5. This may have occurred in order to make the construction more precise, since construal with the genitive here would have given καλου γευσαμενους θεου ρηματος, and the word modified by καλου would thus be in doubt. Michel, by the way, comments (*Der Brief an die Hebräer*, p. 243 n. 6 [from p. 242]): "Der Wechsel im Objekt (Gen., Akkus.) . . . braucht inhaltlich nichts auszumachen."

[258] Kenyon says that this reading is "per errorem pro -ιαν." The reading is certainly an error, but Hoskier is surely correct when he points out that the scribe is simply taking αιωνια as modifying τα αγια, and not λυτρωσιν (*A Commentary*, p. 44). Hoskier goes on to note that

> "the Latin can be read both ways:
> in sancta eterna, redemptione inventâ (or: repertâ),
> in sancta, eternâ redemptione inventâ (" ");
> in fact, *d* says: in sanctis eternis, expiatione reperta."

[259] Hoskier (*ibid*., p. 45) remarks: "This is not necessarily an '*error*', for δια τουτου του Χριστου may be understood." But such an understanding would require that the μεσιτης *not* be Christ, and this would contradict He 12:24. Moreover, when we see that P^{46} often makes simple vowel

interchanges, then the most likely explanation is that P^{46} has just erred again here.

[260] Hoskier (*ibid*., p. 54) suggests that P^{46} is correct with this reading.

[261] Hoskier (*ibid*., p. 55) notes: "There can be no question here of its [the omission of κατηγωνισαντο] not being an error, but the ninefold verbal narrative in vv. 33-34 explains how one of the first two verbs ending in -το could be dropped, especially if the original was in the not unusual short lines." Hoskier continues by saying that βασιλεις is "an easy mistake, if it be a mistake, for it is quite a possible reading." I believe that the much more likely explanation is that the scribe read οι as the article, changed βασιλειας to βασιλεις in order to have a noun for οι, and then omitted the verb as unintelligible.

[262] Metzger, *Commentary*, pp. 592-93, connects τινα and ηλθεν, and notes that the latter reading "is probably due to scribes who either imitated ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς of ver. 11, or were unconsciously influenced by careless assonance with the immediately preceding and following verbs that end in -εν."

Notice, though, that in P^{46} the preceding verb is συνησθειον. The United Bible Societies edition cites P^{46vid} for the second reading, and Metzger follows this notation, although the reading is clear. And Metzger also adds "vid" for the first reading (where P^{48} is printed for P^{46}), even though only the first letter is not clear.

[263] See note 206 above.

[264] Cf. BDF, §254(2).

[265] See Kenyon, *Pauline Epistles, Text*, p. xiv, and cf. Chapter II, note 96, on confusions involving augments.

[266] See note 45 above; this may well be just a partial correction.

[267] See Chapter II, note 97.

[268] See Chapter II, note 100.

[269] See Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*, and BDF, §101. As BDF notes, P^{46} has forms of εσθιειν three times earlier in the verse.

[270] Κρειας is the Epic form of κρεας (cf. LSJ, *s.v.*). Of course, the sound confusion here could just be orthographic, as at 1 Cor 14:9; see note 130 above.

[271] As noted by Kenyon, *Pauline Epistles, Text*, p. xiv, such spellings also occur in P^{47} (but only at Re 12:13b with γυναικαν is P^{47} singular). On the interchange see BDF, §46(1), and cf. the singulars Jn 6:52 and 6:53 (σαρκαν bis) in P^{66}, as well as 1 Pe 1:3c (ελπιδαν) in P^{72}. Of course, the shift here merely involves the addition of -ν, and so could be viewed as orthographic.

[272] Cf. BDF, §32(1), and LSJ, *s.* βύβλος.

[273] See Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*, on the meanings involved in this shift from the middle indicative to the active participle.

[274] Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1860b, on the use of present and aorist subjunctives together.

[275] In connection with P^{45}'s reading at Lk 11:21 (where 1241 supports P^{45}), Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 45, notes that itacism (from ω to ο) "has abetted the transformation" here, but then goes on to claim that this reading is an example of the general shift from perfects to aorists. Since P^{45} is not singular at Lk 11:21, it happens that P^{45} has no singular example of such a shift. But Birdsall's statement is relevant to these examples in P^{46}:

> "The perfect was in process of decay in the Hellenistic period and disappearing before the encroachment of the aorist: thus we have an antecedent probability that perfects will be original, aorists corrections, perhaps unconscious."

One may also compare BDF, §340. The evidence from the singulars in P^{46} is evenly divided, since one case of the shift from perfect to aorist is a harmonization.

[276] Kenyon prints ζων εν α̣υ̣τ̣[ω εκ] δ̣υ̣[ναμεως θ̅υ̅], but in fact ζωμεν̣ σ̣υ̣ν̣ α̣υ̣τ̣ω̣ ε̣κ̣ [δυναμεως θ̅υ̅] is more likely. In any case, ζωμεν is clear, contrary to Kenyon and also to Nestle-Aland, where P^{46} is cited for ζησομεν, which is certainly incorrect.

[277] BDF, §364(3), calls the present subjunctive in 1 Cor 11:33 and Col 3:9 "incorrect."

[278] There is also the nonsense reading, Ga 5:16, of the same sort; see note 165 above.

[279] I suppose that κατεστησαν here would be the second aorist active (for the first aorist passive), and could have the same meaning as the ordinary text (cf. LSJ, *s.v.*, on the meanings).

[280] See note 262 above; evidently our scribe became confused at Ga 2:12.

[281] Of course, εκαστος can take a plural verb; see Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §951, and BDF, §305. However, a plural verb with the ετερος of P^{46} (He 8:11b) would be impossible. Beare, "The Text," pp. 386-87, thought that it was probable that P^{46} was correct at He 8:11a-b, and that the other manuscripts have been harmonized to the LXX (Jr 31:34 [LXX 38:34]). Zuntz, however, claims that the εκαστος in the second part of the verse shows that P^{46}'s text at He 8:11a-b "is a mere scribal slip" (*Text*, p. 19, n. 6). Zuntz further notes (*ibid.*, p. 19) that the singular διδαξη tends "to give the wording an Attic polish, which is out of place in a quotation from the Septuagint." But I suppose that this point has weight only if one reads εκαστος against P^{46}.

Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 43) says that "the Papyrus would seem to have exercised the proper choice of the number to use here," and takes this as supporting the authenticity of P^{46}'s reading. In fact, this proper choice of number is surely the ground for the change to the singular verb. The singular reading at He 8:11b must be viewed simply as a slip.

[282] On this confusion see BDF, §107 and §307(1). Note also that at 1 Cor 14:21a P^{46} replaces εν by εαν.

[283] The reading of P^{46} here is unclear. Kenyon edits μ[η], the reading of 33 489. However, despite Kenyon's printing μ (with no dot) the first letter surely is closer to Δ (the upper half or so seems clear).

[284] Cf. BDF, §443(1) and §445(1). The sound confusion of δ and τ, of course, may be involved here.

[285] Cf. Metzger, *Text*, pp. 191-92, and Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 262-67.

[286] Cf. also Php 1:7, where the prefix συν is replaced by και.

[287] The only other occurrence of συναπαγω in the New Testament is at 2 Pe 3:17, where no textual variation is reported.

[288] This word is first attested in the second century B.C., while συναγωγη is found from Thucydides on. So it is possible that the scribe desired to transmit the earlier form, although probably just the rarity of επισυναγωγη is an adequate explanation. Cf. the replacement in P^{45} of επισυναγω by συναγω, as discussed in Chapter II above.

[289] Cf. also 1 Cor 16:15, which as noted earlier is a harmonization to Ro 16:5. See also Ro 16:7a, where P^{46} is almost singular with ιουλιαν, which has substantial versional support (and also support from 6). Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 539, suggests that this latter substitution and the reverse substitution by C* F G at Ro 16:15 are simply clerical errors.

[290] Cf. BDF, §55(1). By the way, the reading μωυση at He 8:5a could conceivably be an alternative spelling of the nominative, but it is more likely a dative, as indeed Hoskier (*A Commentary*, p. 42) takes, on the basis of P^{46} and versions, to be the authentic reading.

[291] See the examples in BDF, §55. At Col 4:10 P^{46} has βαρναβα as the genitive with the other manuscripts, so the reading at Ga 2:1 must be merely a slip.

[292] Cf. BDF, §55(1a), for the relevant endings.

[293] Cf. He 12:1b cited above and note 108.

[294] BDF, §39(2). At Mt 27:46 B reads κ, and at Mk 15:34 ℵ* A read κ.

[295] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 118-19, gives no example of the insertion of a medial nasal between vowels. However, there are a few examples of the omission of a medial nasal between vowels (see p. 117, the last three examples under *b*), and P^{46} apparently has such a case at He 10:22 (but see note 82 above). By the way, P^{46} has αχαια at Ro 15:26 and 2 Cor 1:1, the only other occurrences of the word in the extant papyrus.

[296] If P^{46} were a more recent document one could postulate a confusion of the minuscule versions of ν and β to account for the shift from νηρεα to βηρεα. But in uncials the confusion is extraordinary, and there seems to be no similarity in sound to explain the shift.

[297] P^{47} may have such a duplication at Re 11:12b. See my "'Their Fifteen Enemies': The Text of Rev. xi. 12 in P^{47} and 1611," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 31 (1980), pp. 78-80.

[298] BDF, §64(2), suggests that ουδ ως here in P^{46} "may well be a classicism." However, this scribal leap seems to be an easier explanation of the reading.

[299] *Text*, p. 20.

[300] "Le Codex," p. 66.

[301] *Ibid*.

[302] There διανοιας is read by ς 255 635 642 2298. Von Soden notes the parallel at 1 Pe 1:13, which just possibly could have influenced P^{46} at 1 Cor 14:25a.

[303] *Text*, p. 19.

[304] See Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*

[305] Bauer (*ibid*., *s.* αναβαινω, *ad fin.*) notes that the Semitic idiom αναβαινει επι καρδιαν is paralleled in non-Semitic Greek by αναβαινει επι νουν

[306] Kenyon says that this latter reading is "per errorem mirum." However, I have above followed Zuntz (Text, p. 18 n. 2) in seeing the influence of νεκροις in He 9:17.

[307] "Le Codex," p. 65.

[308] BDF, §267. Note the difficulties which the similar use of το gave many scribes, including the scribe of P^{45}, at Mk 9:23 (cf. Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 100).

[309] "The Text," pp. 387-89.

[310] *A Commentary*, p. 30: "it looks *optime* to me, and an earlier reading than the usual one."

[311] *Text*, p. 22. Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 669, says that this is "an interesting reading, but one which certainly cannot be original, for the construction of the sentence implies a contrast between εἰκών and σκιά."

[312] *Text*, pp. 22-23.

[313] *Ibid*., p. 23, and notes 1 and 2. Zuntz admits that he cannot find the support claimed by Merk from Ephraem, and the quotation from Clement (ὁ νόμος σκιὰ καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς ἀληθείας) hardly seems direct enough to justify Zuntz's claim that Clement "appears to have had the same wording [as the reading of P^{46}] in mind."

[314] It is clear from our analysis that the scribe of P^{46} did not have such perfect command, but then we have seen that he is perfectly well able to alter his text on occasion in order to transmit a grammatical text, and indeed a text which may be smoother or easier in some respects. By the way, one might well wonder how likely it is that any scribe would have a "perfect command" of Greek; indeed, who at any time has had a "perfect command" of Greek? Nevertheless, it is clear that many scribes have had sufficient linguistic abilities (and perhaps audacity) to change the text in ingenious ways.

[315] See Zuntz, *Text*, pp. 20-22, and also Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, p. 330 n. 2.

[316] In Gn 25:34 and Dt 21:17, as pointed out in LSJ and by Hoskier, *A Commentary*, p. 59. Cf. also BDF, §120(1).

[317] Howard Eshbaugh, "Textual Variants and Theology: A Study of the Galatians Text of Papyrus 46," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 3 (1979), pp. 60-72.

[318] *Ibid*., p. 63.

[319] There is also the reading at He 11:33, where a verb is omitted and βασιλειας changed to βασιλεις (see note 261 above), as well as other omissions of verbs along with additional words.

[320] "Textual Variants," p. 64.

[321] See He 2:8a; 1 Cor 8:3, 9:7; Ga 2:5a; Col 1:27.

[322] See the citation from Hort in Chapter I, note 80.

[323] At 3:17 and 4:7 P^{46} has strong Alexandrian support, at 2:20 is supported by B D* F G, and at 1:6 is supported by F G H^{vid}.

[324] As a summary statement Eshbaugh ("Textual Variants," p. 68) says: "If P^{46} is a secondary text, these variants suggest that P^{46} has a subordinationist Christology." Eshbaugh is here referring to Ga 1:6, 2:20, 3:17, 4:6, and 4:7. But only one of these can be reasonably attributed to P^{46}, namely the singular 4:6, which is surely secondary. Unless one is prepared to hold the scribe responsible for the text which he copies correctly from his *Vorlage*, only 4:6 should come under consideration here, and there accidental omission is quite possible.

By the way, Eshbaugh (*ibid*., p. 61 and note 1 on p. 69) comments on the frequency of appeals to "accident" in Metzger's *Commentary*, appeals which might be thought to rule out theological considerations from the beginning. Here, however, the appeal to accident (or to a striving for brevity) is based not on an a priori view of what influences scribes felt, but rather on the empirically established tendencies of the particular scribe involved.

[325] If Eshbaugh were correct in his claim that the scribe of P^{46} "has a subordinationist Christology" (see note 324 above), then we would have an interesting contrast with the scribe of P^{72}, who, according to Marchant A. King ("Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Jude and 1 and 2 Peter," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 121 [1964], p. 57), shows "the fullest acceptance of the deity of Christ" and indeed seems to have "the highest possible Christology." For further details on P^{72} see Chapter VI below.

[326] On this reading see Sanders, *Codex*, p. 19, and BDF, §21. Cf. also Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 126.

[327] On the confusion of δ and ζ see Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 75-76; ει for ι is, of course, just an itacism.

CHAPTER IV

THE SCRIBE OF P^{47}

P^{47} is a codex dating from the latter part of the third century,[1] which once contained the entire book of Revelation.[2] Fairly well preserved portions of 10 folios have survived, and are now in Dublin as Chester Beatty Papyrus III.[3] The contents include most of Re 9:10-17:2.

There have been remarkably few studies devoted to P^{47}, and most of the attention given to it has concentrated on its textual relationships. Kenyon was able to say, in fact, only that P^{47} sided with the uncials ℵ A C P, being "closest to ℵ and C, with P next, and A rather further away."[4] On the basis of the comprehensive study by Schmid, however, a more precise characterization is possible. Schmid isolates four main branches of the textual tradition of Revelation: AC, P^{47}ℵ, Aν (the commentary of Andreas), and *K* (the Koine).[5] Besides thus separating P^{47}ℵ from the other manuscripts, Schmid also aligns these two with the testimony of Origen, thus speaking of "Der Text von *P*^{47} S und Origenes."[6] Indeed, Schmid provides a list of 36 readings where P^{47} and ℵ agree against the other three chief branches.[7] On the basis of the support from less important witnesses for readings in this list, Schmid also finds "Zeugen zweiten und dritten Ranges" for this textual family: family 1006 and 2344; and family 1678, 1611, 1854, and cop.[8] Schmid does not devote much attention to the versional evidence,[9] but Coptic support for the text found in an Egyptian papyrus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Origen, seems a priori plausible enough.

The writing of P^{47} is, according to Kenyon, "rather rough in character, thick in formation, and with no pretensions to calligraphy."[10] There are few _lapsus_ and comparatively few corrections, thus justifying Kenyon's comment: "The writing is generally correct."[11] Abbreviations for _nomina sacra_ frequently occur, but there are no breathings or marks of punctuation.[12]

Again we have only Kenyon's apparatus--with all its imperfections--as a "list" of singulars.[13] On the basis of the plates, P^{47} was first collated against Tischendorf, and then against von Soden, followed by Hoskier. The large number of asterisked readings is due in part to the fairly limited textual basis utilized by Tischendorf, and in even larger part to the totally comprehensive textual basis utilized by Hoskier. Indeed, Hoskier collates all the manuscripts available to him, and records even the most trivial variations of spelling or punctuation. Some of the support thus forthcoming for the readings of P^{47} may well be coincidental, of course, but it seems certain that virtually all of the (non-asterisked) singulars in our list really are singulars. A further collation of the readings was made against the apparatus of Schmid's edition of the Andreas commentary;[14] this permitted the citation of some additional support for P^{47}'s asterisked readings, and to note the support from 1773 (which was not utilized by Hoskier) on several occasions. In particular, P^{47}'s reading at 14:8 is seen to be merely an orthographic variant of 1773's reading. Finally, a collation was made against the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland, and this permitted the asterisking of 11:5 and 11:7b.

The list of singulars was, as usual, checked against Kenyon's apparatus, and the discrepancies were investigated further.[15] Thus, the resulting list of singulars is as follows.

Revelation

9:10 κεντρα ς rell : [κε]νδρ̣α̣ P^{47} :
κενστρα 2058^{vid} : κεντροις 2061

9:11 αβαδδων ς ℵ A P al : αβ(β)α(α)δ(δ)ων 046
pm : βαδδον 2053^{comm} (txt βανδων) :
βαττων P^{47} $cop^{sa^{ms}}$ (ⲃⲁⲧⲧⲱⲛ) : ⲁⲃⲁⲧⲧⲱⲛ $cop^{sa^{ms}}$

** 9:14a σαλπιγγα ς pm : σαλπιγγαν P^{47} 1918

** 9:14b τεσσαρας ς pm : om P^{47} 2029

9:14c τω ποταμω τω μεγαλω ευφρατη ς ℵ A 046 (εφρατη)
pm : του ποταμου του μεγαλου ευφρατου P^{47} (του
ευφρατου Epiph) : τη ψαμμω του ποταμου του
μεγαλου ευφρατου 1678 1778 2080

9:18a τουτων ς rell : om P^{47}

9:18b αυτων ς rell : om P^{47}

9:19 η γαρ εξουσια ℵ A C P 046 pm : ην γαρ η
εξουσια P^{47} : αι γαρ εξουσιαι ς 1 2186 2428

9:20a και τα (om ς) ειδωλα ς ℵ A C P 046 pm :
om P^{47} $cop^{sa^{mss}}$

** 9:20b αργυρα ς rell : αργυρεα P^{47} 2351 (-αια txt,
-εα comm)

** 9:20c τα ξυλινα ς rell : ξυλινα P^{47} P^{85vid} 1773
1854 2329 pc

9:21 ουτε εκ των κλεμματων αυτων ς rell :
om P^{47} vg^{ms} syr^{ph} cop^{sa} Prim

Revelation

10:3a μυκαται ς ℵ A C P 046 pm : μυχαται P^{47}

10:3b αι επτα ς $\aleph^{c}$ A C P 046 pm : αι P^{47} :
επτα $\aleph^{*}$ 1611 al : om 1876 2043 2082 :
om vel αι eth^{ro} : (αι) επτα eth^{pp}

10:4a και οσα ελαλησαν ℵ 2043 pc : και ηκουσα οσα
ελαλησαν P^{47} cop^{bo} : και οτε (om 2014)
ελαλησαν ς rell

10:4b αι επτα pri ς rell : αι P^{47} : επτα 1 296 522*

10:4c γραφειν ς rell (046 pc -φην) : αυτα γραφειν
P^{47} cop^{bo} : γραφειν αυτα 1854

** 10:4d φωνην et λεγουσαν ς pm : φωνης et λεγουσης
P^{47} 743 2067

** 10:4e μη ταυτα ς pc : μη αυτας P^{47} 1849 syr^{h}

** 10:5 χειρα ς rell : χειραν P^{47} 522* 616 1734
1918 2033

10:8 η φωνη ς rell : φωνη P^{47} : om η φωνη et
φωνην pro ην 1006 2329 pc (1854 την φωνην)

** 10:10 βιβλαριδιον ς A C P al : βιβλιδιον P^{47}
2065 2432

10:11 βασιλευσι(ν) ς ℵ A P 046 pm : βασιλευσις P^{47}

11:1 καλαμος ομοιος ς ℵ A P 046 pm :
[κ]ạλαμονος P^{47}

Revelation

11:2 την αυλην την ς ℵ^{c} A P 046 pm : την P^{47} : την αυλην 452 467 1948 2031 2329 : της αυλης της ℵ* : την αυλην την αυλην την 792 2034

** 11:5 θελη pri ς pc : θ̣ε̣λησει P^{47} 1841 pc it vg Hipp (arm ?)

** 11:6 εξουσιαν (sec) εχουσιν ς pm : εχουσιν εξουσιαν P^{47} 1854

11:7a τελεσωσι(ν) ς rell : τελωσιν P^{47} : τελεσουσι 1 2037 pc : τελεσω 250 424 616

** 11:7b το θηριον το ς pm : τοτε το θηριον το P^{47} 2344 cop$^{sa,bo^{CZ}}$ arm^{la}

** 11:10 ουτοι ς rell : om P^{47} 1888 2045* 2065 2432 pc syr^{ph} cop^{sa}

11:11 τρεις ημερας και (C add το) ημισυ (-ου ℵ* A) ς ℵ A C P 046 pm : τρις ημερας ημισυ P^{47} cop^{sa} : τρεις και ημισυ ημερας 2014 2015 2037 pc : τρεις ημισυ ημερας 69 2329 pc

11:12a εθεωρησαν ς rell : εμετρησαν P^{47} : εθεωρουν 498 1704 2058

** 11:12b εχθροι ς rell : ι̣ε̣ (= δεκαπεντε) εχθροι P^{47vid} 1611

11:13 εκεινη ς rell : αυτη P^{47}

Revelation

11:16 επι τους θρονους αυτων ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm : om P^{47} arm^{1}

11:17a κυριε ς rell : κυριος ℵ 598* : ο $\overline{\text{κς}}$ (= κυριος) P$^{47c(\text{man } 1)}$ cop : ο $\overline{\text{θς}}$ (= θεος) P^{47*} : om 141

11:17b ο θεος ς rell : ο $\overline{\text{θς}}$ (= θεος) ο $\overline{\text{θς}}$ (= θεος) P^{47}

11:17c την μεγαλην ς rell : την μενουσαν P^{47} : om 2019

11:18a ο καιρος ς rell : καιρος P$^{47\text{vid}}$: ο κληρος C 2053$^{\text{comm}}$ (et 2065 in verbis repetitis post νεκρων)

** 11:18b τοις αγιοις και τοις φοβουμενοις ς pm : τοις αγιοις και τους φοβουμε[νους] P^{47} 2351

12:2a εχουσα ς rell : εχουσαν P^{47} : εχουσαι 2059

(o) 12:2b κραζει ς ℵ A P 051 al : κραδει P^{47} : κραξει 2042$^{\text{vid}}$ 2254$^{\text{vid}}$: εκραζεν C pm : εκραξεν 046 al

** 12:3 αυτου ς pm : om P^{47} 2053$^{\text{txt}}$

** 12:4 εβαλεν ς pm : εβαλλεν P$^{47(? *, \text{ corr } -αλε-)}$ 69 469 pc

12:6 ,$\overline{\text{ασξ}}$ vel χιλιας διακοσιας εξηκοντα ς ℵ (ℵ^{cc*} add πεντε) A C P 046 051 pm : $\overline{\text{ρ̣σξ}}$ P^{47} : ,$\bar{\text{α}}\bar{\text{ω}}$ξ vel χιλιας οκτακοσιας εξηκοντα 61 69 1854

12:9a ο αρχαιος ς rell (2065 ο αρχεμος) : om P^{47}

** 12:9b αυτου pri ς rell : om P^{47} 2053$^{\text{txt}}$ pc cop$^{\text{bo}}$

Revelation

12:10 εξουσια ς rell : σωτηρια P^{47} : βασιλεια 792 : θυσια 2256

** 12:11a δια sec ς pm : om P^{47} 498 1704 2031 2056 2058

12:11b αχρι ς rell (αρχη 046) : αθρι P^{47} : μεχρι 42 367 632 2019 al

12:13a εδιωξεν ς rell : απηλθεν εκδιωξαι P^{47} : εδιωκεν 1678^{comm} 1778^{comm} 1854 2053^{txt} et comm : εδωκεν ℵ* : εξεδιωξεν $\aleph^{c}$

12:13b την γυναικα ς rell : την γυναικαν P^{47} : την γυνην 2026

12:14a πτερυγες ς rell : πτερυγας P^{47}

** 12:14b καιρους ς rell : καιρου P^{47} 2053^{txt*} (808 1893 καιρου pro και καιρους)

** 12:15 εκ ς rell : απο P^{47} 1678 1778 2042 2080

12:16a αυτης ς rell (στομαυτης 2254) : της P^{47}

** 12:16b εκ ς pm : απο P^{47} 2042

** 13:4a προσεκυνησαν pri ς pm : προσεκυνησεν P^{47} 141 (-σε) 2019 (-σε) 2344 syr^{ph}

13:4b και προσεκυνησαν τω θηριω (το θηριον ς A pc) λεγοντες τις ομοιος τω θηριω ς ℵ A C P 046 pm : om P^{47} : λεγοντες (et om και προσ. τω δρακοντι usque θηριω) 2060 2286 2302 : τις ομοιος τω θηριω 2256 : λεγοντες τις ομοιος τω θηριω 051 181 209 2019 al

Revelation

** 13:5 λαλουν ς pm : λαλουντα P^{47} 2256

13:6a εις (ως 1894) βλασφημιαν ς rell : εις βλασφημιας ℵ A C al : βλασφημησαι P^{47} syr^{ph} cop

13:6b τους (om 1854 2018) εν τω ουρανω σκηνουντας (-τες ℵ) ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm : εν τω ουρανω P^{47} eth arm^{mss}

13:11a ομοια ς rell (ομια 2033) : ομοιω P^{47} : ομοιον 792 (et αρνιον pro αρνιω) : ονομα C

13:11b ελαλει ς pm : λαλει P^{47} it^{gig} : ελαλησαν 2042

13:14 εζησεν ς rell (εζησαν 1918) : ζησας P^{47}

13:15 του θηριου ινα και λαληση η εικων του θηριου και ποιηση (vel -σει) ς ℵ A P 046 051 pm : του ποι̣η̣[σαι] P^{47} : του θηριου και ποιηση 69 2014 al : om ινα και - θηριου tert C 181 2015 2053$^{txt\ et\ comm}$: om και ποιηση - θηριου tert 1894 2026*

** 13:17 το ονομα του θηριου A P 046 051 pm : η το ονομ̣α του θηριου P^{47} ς (nullus codex apud Tisch.) 628 1719 2049 2091 it^{gig} vg^{cl} Bea

13:18 και (om 046 al) ο αριθμος αυτου εστιν (om A 046 al) ς A C P 046 051 pm : εστιν δε P^{47} : om plane ℵ 2053^{comm} pc

14:2a εκ ς rell : ως εκ P^{47}

Revelation

** 14:2b κιθαρωδων ς 1 al : ως φωνην κιθαρ̣[ω]δων P^{47} 2436

14:4 μετα γυναικων ουκ ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm :
μη μετα γυναικω[ν] P^{47}

** 14:6 φυλην και γλωσσαν ς pm : φυλων και γλωσσων
P^{47} 620 628

14:7 δοτε αυτω (αυτον 792) δοξαν ς rell (1778 2015 pc
pon αυτω post δοξαν) : δοξασατε αυτον δοξα̅
(= δοξαν) P^{47} (eth δοξασατε αυτον)

(o) 14:8 ηκολουθη 1773 : ηκολουθει P^{47} syr^{ph} arab :
ηκολουθησε ς rell : ηλθε 2045 pc

14:9a προσκυνει (vel -η vel -ησει) ς rell :
προκυνει P^{47}

** 14:9b την χειρα ς pm : της χειρο[ς] P^{47} 94 1611
1773 2329 pc

14:12 εστιν post αγιων ς rell : εστιν post
ωδε pri P^{47} : om εστιν 808 1893

** 14:13a οι sec ς rell : om P^{47} 1746 2042

** 14:13b ινα ς pm : οτι P^{47} 2019** 2429

** 14:14a επι pri ς rell : ο επι P^{47} 2029

** 14:14b καθημενος ομοιος ς pc : καθημενος ομοιον
P^{47} 1955

** 14:14c δρεπανον ς rell : δραπανον P^{47} 2051 2067

Revelation

14:15a κραζων ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm : α[να]κραζων P^{47vid} Prim

** 14:15b εν ς rell : om P^{47} 792 1773 2329 it^{gig} vg

14:15c δρεπανον ς rell : δραπανον P^{47} : δρεπανονον 1918

** 14:15d ηλθεν ς rell (-ον 1728^{vid}) : [ε]ξηλθεν P^{47} 172 2018

14:15e η ωρα (add του ς ℵ pc) θερισαι (θερισμου ℵ pc) οτι εξηρανθη ο θερισμος της γης ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm : ο θερισμος οτι ε̣[ξηρανθη] P^{47vid} pr sp : η ωρα θερισαι 1611

14:16 δρεπανον ς rell : δραπαν[ον] P^{47}

** 14:17a του εν τω ς pm : αυτου εν τω P^{47} 209 598 pc

14:17b δρεπανον ς rell : δραπανον P^{47} : δρεπανα 2015

14:18a κραυγη ς C P 051 pm : κραυη P^{47} : φωνη ℵ A 046 al

** 14:18b δρεπανον pri ς pm : δραπανον P^{47} 2043

** 14:18c δρεπανον sec ς rell : δραπανον P^{47} 2043

14:19a δρεπανον ς rell : δραπανον P^{47} : δρεπαναν 2065

** 14:19b εις την γην ς pm : επι την γην P^{47} 1611

** 14:19c την ληνον et την μεγαλην ς al : την ληνον et του μεγαλου P^{47} 1611 2078 2436

14:20 αχρι ς rell : μεχρι P^{47}

Revelation

15:1 εν αυταις (ταυταις 051 al) ετελεσθη ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm : ετελεσθη εν αυταις P^{47}

15:2 εχοντας ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm : [εχοντας εκ του θηριου και της εικονος αυτου και εκ του αριθμου του ονοματος α]υτου ε̣[στ]ωτας [επι την θαλασσαν την υ]ελινην εχοντας P^{47vid}

15:3 αδουσιν ς rell : α̣δωσιν P^{47} : αδοντας ℵ pc

15:4a δοξασει vel δοξαση ς rell : δοξισει P^{47} : δοξασοι 181 2019 pc : θαυμαση 1854

15:4b μονος οσιος ς ℵ A C P 051 al : μονος συ P^{47} : μονος αγιος 046 pm : συ μονος οσιος 2026 2057 : συ ει μονος αγιος 468 (?) : μονος συ οσιος 2091 : μονος ει οσιος 241 1678 pc : μονος οσιος ει 1773 2019 pc : μονος ει αγιος 743 2067 pc : μονος αγιος ει 60 432 al : μονος αγιος συ ει 2015

15:4c εφανερωθησαν ς rell : εφανερωθη P^{47}

15:6 περιεζωσμενοι ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm : περιεσζ̣ω̣μενοι P^{47} : περιζωσμενοι 1 (?) 181 pc : περισζωσμενοι Compl.

15:7a ζωων ς rell : om P^{47}

** 15:7b εδωκεν ς rell : εδωκαν P^{47} 2031 2056

16:1 εις (om 2045*, επι 2037 al) την γην ς rell : om P^{47} it^{h} cop^{sa} arm^{4}

Revelation

16:2 εξεχεεν ς rell : εξεχεην P^{47}

16:3 απεθανεν ς rell : απεθανον P^{47} cop eth^{ro} : εξεχεεν 1678

** 16:8 αυτω ς rell (αυτου 1918) : om P^{47} 920 1859 2027 2256

16:10 εσκοτωμενη ς א* A C P 051 pm : εσκωτωμενην P^{47} : εσκοτισμενη א^{cc} 046 1611 al

** 16:11 εβλασφημησαν ς P^{47*} pm : εβλασφημουν P^{47c} 1678 1778 2080 it^{gig} cop$^{sa,bo^{ms}}$

16:18 ανθρωποι εγενοντο א 046 051 1611 al (ς al praem οι) : ανθρωπος εγενετο A 254 : ανθρωπος εγενοντο P^{47}

16:19 των εθνων ς rell (τον νεθνων 1918) : αι των εθνων P^{47} : om plane 2031 2056

16:20 ευρεθησαν ς rell (ηυ- 051 pc) : ευρεθη P^{47}

17:1 των υδατων των πολλων ς 046 al : υδα[των των πολ]λων P^{47vid} pr sp cop$^{sa^{vid}}$: υδατων πολλων א A P al : των υδατων πολλων 2429 arm^{vid}

The total number of singular readings in P^{47} is thus 74, of which 18 are orthographic singulars and 5 are nonsense readings. There thus remain 51 significant singulars.

Corrections.--In his introductory remarks on P^{47} Kenyon provides no information concerning corrections by anyone other than the scribe,[16] and in fact all 13 of the corrections appear (from the photographs) to be from the scribe himself. It is absolutely certain that the original scribe was responsible for the correction at 12:16, where he erased the ν before proceeding with γυναικι,[17] and also for the correction at 16:14, where he changed his mind about how to divide the word αυτους.[18] In the other cases the writing seems to be consistent with the scribe's hand, and so one may assume that no later corrector dealt with the papyrus.[19]

Four of the corrections are weighty enough that one may suspect that the scribe compared the codex with a second exemplar, and corrected accordingly to another text:[20] 10:4, 11:10, 13:16, and 16:11. The correction at 15:3 could also be such a case, although the two spellings are common enough that one probably does not need to postulate a second exemplar. At 16:14 only the division between syllables is involved, and at 16:15 we have simply a shift to an itacistic spelling. The corrections at 12:16, 13:3, and 14:11 are obvious, as is 14:10, where the scribe seems to have lost his place and repeated θυμου (or θ̅υ̅ μου) from earlier in the verse. (Nine consecutive words ending with -ου would make such confusion plausible.[21]) And at 11:17, not noted by Kenyon,[22] the scribe leapt ahead to write the later ο θ̅ς̅, but then corrected himself to write "Lord" (while keeping the case and article of the later word).[23]

9:20 is an interesting case, since the correction here gives three uncontracted forms of the adjectives in this verse.[24] The textual evidence is as follows:

χρυσα	:	χρυσεα	P^{47} 2351^{txt}	=	χρυσαια	ℵ 2351^{comm}
αργυρα	:	αργυρεα	P^{47} 2351^{comm}	=	αργυραια	2351^{txt}
χαλκα	:	χαλκεα	P^{47c} ℵ	=	χαλκαια	2351^{comm}

The agreements in reading the uncontracted forms may well be accidental, as various scribes tried to write what they viewed as "correct" Greek. It is, in fact, tempting to believe that the contracted forms stood in the exemplar of P^{47}, but our scribe wanted to write the uncontracted forms. However, he carried through his intention only partially as he copied, writing the contracted form of the third adjective. It is likely that he corrected himself immediately.

Orthography.--Eighteen of the singulars of P^{47} arise from variations in spelling occasioned by confusions of similar sounds.[25] Some of these could be considered to be different words which would then be nonsense in context, but they in any case should not be treated as significant singulars.[26]

Four readings result from confusion of ν or ς:

Addition of final ν before a word beginning with a stop:[27] 12:2a, 16:10.[28]

Omission of medial σ before a velar stop:[29] 14:9a.[30]

Final ν replaced by final ς:[31] 10:11.

And there are also the following confusions of consonants:

δ for τ medially after ν:[32] 9:10.

χ for ϰ intervocalically:[33] 10:3a.

δ for ζ:[34] 12:2b.

σζ for ζ[35] and omission of medial σ:[36] 15:6.

And at 14:18a we have the omission of γ.[37]

The following replacements of vowels were found:

η for ε:[38] 16:2.

ει for η:[39] 14:8.

ι for α:[40] 15:4a.[41]

ω for α:[42] 13:11a.[43]

α for ε:[44] 12:14a, as well as the four examples of the spelling δραπανον for δρεπανον: 14:15c, 14:16, 14:17b, and 14:19a. P^{47} actually spells the word this way consistently,[45] but finds (surely coincidental) support at 14:14c, 14:18b, and 14:18c.

We see, then, that 18 of the 74 singulars are orthographic, or almost one-fourth (24.3%). P^{47} is thus demonstrated to be even more erratic than P^{46} in his spelling.

Nonsense Readings.--There are only 2 strictly nonsense readings in P^{47}: 11:1 (in part a leap from -μο- to -μο-) and 12:11b.[46] These 2 constitute 2.7% of the singulars. Two more readings are nonsense in context: 12:16a (the omission of αυ-) and 15:2 (a long dittography).[47] And one further reading should probably be considered nonsense: 12:6. Here the scribe appears to have just misread ,λ as ρ.[48]

These 5 nonsense readings form 6.8% of the singulars, and thus P^{47} is not far behind P^{46} in the frequency of nonsense found among the singulars. The sheer mass of singulars present in P^{46} creates the image of carelessness, but one must keep in mind that P^{46} is represented by 86 folios while P^{47} has only 10. Thus, P^{46} has 8.6 times as many folios as P^{47} (and their extent is approximately the same), and in fact P^{46} has almost exactly 9 times as many singulars as P^{47}. Thus, the percentages of orthographic and nonsense readings give a better idea of the abilities of these scribes to spell and to create a meaningful text, than do the mere numbers of readings in each category.

There remain 51 significant singulars, and we now turn to their analysis.

Additions.--There are 5 significant singulars (9.8% of the significant singulars) which are additions. One of these is a dittography: 11:17b.[49] The other 4 additions have probably arisen by harmonization to the context: 10:4a (ηκουσα in vs. 4b), 10:4c (αυτα in vs. 4d),[50] 14:2a (where ως occurs three times later in the verse),[51] and 16:19 (αι before πολεις).[52]

The dittography is of 2 words,[53] and the other 4 additions are of 1 word each. So only 5 words are added, an average of 1.3 words per addition.

Omissions.--There are 18 omissions (35.3% of the significant singulars), 9 of which have perhaps arisen by a scribal leap.[54] The omissions are: 9:18a (πληγων τουτων), 9:18b (στοματων αυτων), 9:20a (δαιμονια ... ειδωλα, the least likely of the leaps),[55] 9:21 (αυτων ... αυτων), 10:3b, 10:4b, 10:8, 11:2 (την ... την), 11:11, 11:16 (επι ... επεσαν), 11:18a, 12:9a (οφις ο αρχαιος ο), 13:4b (θηριω ... θηριω), 13:6b,[56] 13:15, 15:7a (τεσσαρων ζωων), 16:1, and 17:1.[57]

Nine of these 18 omissions are of one word, and may be classified as follows:

a) Articles: 10:8, 11:18a, 17:1.[58]

b) Pronouns: 9:18a, 9:18b.[59]

c) Numerals: 10:3b, 10:4b.

d) Conjunction: 11:11.

e) Noun: 15:7a.

The lengths of the 9 longer omissions are as follows:

3 omissions of 2 words: 11:2, 12:9a, 13:6b.
2 omissions of 3 words: 9:20a,[60] 16:1.
1 omission of 4 words: 11:16.
1 omission of 5 words: 9:21.
2 omission of 9 words: 13:4b, 13:15.[61]

The total here is 48 words omitted, for an average of 2.7 words per omission. Looking just at additions and omissions, we see that there is a net loss of 43 words from the *Vorlage*, and so it is clear that our scribe's copying habits result in a shorter text.

Lagrange, on the basis of a less systematic survey of the readings, asserted that P^{47} "est un ms. court."[62] He goes on to note the dittography at 15:2, and then says:

> Mais dans l'ensemble pap. omet beaucoup de mots par rapport aux grands onciaux. Ces mots ne sont pas ordinairement nécessaires, et on serait tenté de lui donner raison, si l'omission ne s'expliquait très bien par un parti pris de sobriété qui est en grec de l'élégance.[63]

This brevity could indeed be occasioned by a striving for elegance; however, omission by accident is perhaps equally plausible, since half the omissions may be due to scribal leaps.[64] The two omissions of pronouns, for example, could be a result of conscious editing,[65] but in fact both could easily have occurred by homoeoteleuton. But in any case, there is no doubt that the tendency is toward omission.

Transpositions.--There are only 2 cases (3.9% of the significant singulars) of transposition: 14:12 and 15:1. The second, which involves three words, could be explained as a leap due to homoeoarcton (εν ... ετελεσθη), followed by a correction. No such explanation, however, seems possible in the first case, where five words are involved.

UMI

In fact, in both cases we probably have the influence of similar phrases elsewhere in Revelation.[66] P47's reading at 14:12 conforms to what we find at 13:10: ωδε εστιν η υπομονη και η πιστις των αγιων. Similarly, the position of ετελεσθη at 15:1 might have been influenced by the construction at 10:7: και ετελεσθη το μυστηριον του θεου.[67] At least this seems rather more likely than that a leap involving only one letter has occurred.

It is worth noting, by the way, that each of these transpositions moves the verb forward in the sentence. Taken in isolation such a shift could be viewed as toward a more Semitic construction.[68] But it is clear in these cases that some alternative explanation must be (and can readily be) found, so that the "Semitizing" turns out to be an indirect consequence of some other tendency.

Grammatical Changes.--One of the singulars arises from the interchange of grammatical forms: 12:13b (γυναικαν). This spelling is paralleled by σαλπιγγαν at 9:14a, where P47 picks up support from 1918, and by χειραν at 10:5, where P47 is supported by five manuscripts.[69]

At 9:14c επι is taken with the genitive instead of the dative, a feature which appears elsewhere in P47

UMI

with support from other manuscripts.[70] The shift from ου to μη at 14:4 seems to reflect Classical usage.[71]

At 13:14 there is a change from finite verb to participle, and there are 4 shifts in the tenses or moods of verbs:

Aorist to imperfect: 14:8.
Imperfect to present: 13:11b (harmonization).[72]
Future to present subjunctive: 11:7a (harmonization).[73]
Indicative to subjunctive: 15:3.

Three of these 4 changes result, though, from the dropping of a syllable: 11:7a, 13:11b, and 14:8. There is some evidence elsewhere of such a tendency in P^{47},[74] and we have perhaps another aspect of the trend toward brevity.

At 14:7 we have the interesting shift from δοτε αυτω δοξαν to δοξασατε αυτον δοξαν. This use of a cognate accusative seems clear enough, and could reflect a Semitic background.[75] However, the author of Revelation appears to be alluding to Jr 13:16, where the LXX has δοτε τω κυριω θεω υμών δοξαν, which renders the MT's תְּנוּ לַיהוה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם כָּבוֹד. In fact, the construction δοξαζω δοξαν is not cited in the lexica, and is not found in the New Testament, the LXX, Philo, or Josephus. There thus seems to be no appropriate text which could have influenced the scribe of P^{47}.[76]

We can, though, explain the reading as the result of the scribe's ingenious "correction" of an omission by a scribal leap. Let us suppose that the scribe's eye moved from δοτε to δοξαν, and that he thus wrote (let us imagine) τον θ̄ν̄ και δοξα before he caught his error. It is clear that our scribe is reluctant to mar his copy by extensive corrections, and so here he would have attempted to continue his text without erasure and, of course, without producing nonsense. The use of cognate accusatives would be known to anyone familiar with the New Testament, and so the scribe could have discovered the solution to his problem by continuing with δοξασατε for δοτε, retaining δοξαν, and then making the appropriate shift from αυτω to αυτον. That the scribe may well have had the ability and interest to create a reading in such a way will be made more likely by our analysis of some additional readings and tendencies.

Two of our singulars (15:4c and 16:20) arise from P^{47}'s following the grammatical rule of using a singular verb with a neuter plural subject.[77] Schmid's analysis[78] indicates that the author of Revelation fluctuated

UMI

between singular and plural verb (1:19 α εισιν και α μελλει is a good example[79]), and that scribes then fluctuated further, altering the texts in *both* directions.[80] In fact, that P^{47} at least is consistent in its preference for the singular may be seen from the following readings:[81]

9:20	δυνανται: δυναται P^{47} ς 046 1 f^{498} 1611 al
11:18	οργισθησαν: οργισθη P^{47} ℵ* (ωργ-)
12:14	εδοθησαν: εδοθη P^{47} $\aleph^{a}$ f^{205} 209 2029 792 (εδωθη)
14:13	ακολουθει P^{47} cum mss omn
15:4	εφανερωθησαν: εφανερωθη P^{47} solus
16:14	α εκπορευονται 046 f^{104} f^{680} pc :
	α εκπορευεται A 1611 2329 al :
	εκπορευεσθαι P^{47} ς ℵ* 051 1 al
16:20	ευρεθησαν: ευρεθη P^{47} solus

On the other hand, the reading of P^{47} at 16:3 is probably to be viewed as a *constructio ad sensum*,[82] with coincidental agreement from cop eth^{ro}, since πασα ψυχη ζωσα could be taken in the sense of "all living souls."[83] Such constructions are common in Revelation, although I have found no example there or elsewhere of πας with the plural.[84]

A more strained case of a *constructio ad sensum* may be the curious reading at 16:18. The sense required here is, of course, "men" ("man" taken collectively), whichever text is adopted. Thus, the shift from the singular of A 254 to the plural could be seen as clarifying the sense.[85]

But what about P^{47}? Metzger says that the reading of A is preserved "partially" in P^{47},[86] and Schmid says that A receives "nur eine halbe neue Stütze" from P^{47}.[87] It is, however, unclear from such comments why P^{47} should be taken as supporting the reading of A any more than the reading of ℵ 046 051.[88] But the origin of the reading of P^{47} from the reading of A is (more or less) understandable if we view P^{47} as writing a plural verb with ανθρωποϲ taken collectively.[89] The majority of manuscripts then continue this understanding of ανθρωποϲ, but also adjust the number of both subject and verb in order to produce proper syntax. There would, on the other hand, seem to be no explanation of the A reading from the majority text, nor of the P^{47} reading from the majority text, save by scribal "oversight."[90]

So there are sufficient data among our singulars to support the claim that the scribe of P^{47} is concerned with grammar and style. Besides the readings discussed in this section, there are also the uncontracted adjectives found in 9:20, and the tendency to brevity, which may be a tendency to elegance. Lagrange indeed catalogued several more features in his attempt to show that:

> Le souci de pap. d'écrire un grec correct, moins sémitisant, paraît tout à fait incontestable et même ensuite d'un dessein préconçu.[91]

Unfortunately, most of his examples are not of singular readings,[92] and so Lagrange may be appealing in fact to the efforts of even earlier scribes to "correct" the Greek of Revelation. Nevertheless, there are still enough singulars to warrant Lagrange's claim:

> Le pap. est incontestablement un texte poli, qui a voulu écrire un grec correct et plus coulant.[93]

Such a judgment must, however, be tempered by the recognition that the scribe was not fully able to carry out his intentions, as is shown by the substantial number (given the brevity of the extant papyrus) of orthographic errors and nonsense readings.

Harmonizations.--It is difficult to make the division--natural enough in the Gospels--between harmonization to parallels and harmonization to context, since the parallels to texts in Revelation are often part of the same context, taken in a somewhat wide sense.[94] In any case, there seem to be no clear examples[95] of assimilation to passages outside Revelation itself. Besides the 8 cases already mentioned (4 additions, 2 transpositions, and 2 verb changes), there are also the following 5 replacements which are probably the results of harmonization to the context: 11:12a (μετρεω in 11:1-2),[96] 11:17a (ο θ̅ς̅ in the nominative[97] and with the article), 12:10 (σωτηρια in vs. 10a),[98] 12:13a (απηλθεν ποιησαι in vs. 17), and 13:6a (βλασφημησαι in vs. 6b).[99]

Thus, we have a total of 13 instances of harmonization, which constitute 25.5% of the significant singulars.

Proper Names.--Only one of our singulars involves the spelling of a proper name: 9:11, where P[47]'s βαττων is supported by a Sahidic manuscript.[100] This spelling probably arose from the ς ℵ A P reading by a shift from -δδ- to -ττ- and the loss of the initial ἀ-.[101] Both these phenomena are well attested,[102] and the confusion of δ and τ is, as the Sahidic readings confirm, to be attributed to Coptic influence.[103]

Miscellaneous.--There are a few readings whose origins have not yet been discussed:

At 13:18 the reading seems to have arisen in order to avoid the repetition of αριθμος, and thus to give a smoother reading.

At 14:15e I have disagreed with Kenyon's reconstruction, thinking that the space involved makes it more likely that P[47] just read: οτι εξηλθεν ο θερισμος οτι εξηρανθη, and then continued with vs. 16. Thus, there is only one missing line (on which was written και εβαλεν ο καθημενος επι της), not two as Kenyon indicates. The addition of ο θερισμος της γης after εξηρανθη (as supposed, it semms, by Kenyon) would cause the lines to come out incorrect. But how did this reading arise?

I believe that the most likely explanation is that we have here a corrected leap. The scribe jumped from the first οτι to the second,[104] and continued on with εξη-. The scribe did not fully realize his error at this point; however, somehow he managed to return and write εξηλθεν, but then went on with ο θερισμος of the second clause. It looks as though the two phrases beginning with οτι would have stood one over the other in the Vorlage of P^{47} if the lines in that manuscript were of the same length as in P^{47}, and the confusion would thus have been facilitated.

Perhaps such a scenario is unlikely, and we should simply appeal to a deliberate rewording of the text. In this case, it is possible that the phrase ο θερισμος ερχεται in Jn 4:35 could have aided the scribe to write εξηλθεν ο θερισμος. But neither of these explanations is quite as straightforward as one would like.

At 15:4b Kenyon (followed by Nestle-Aland) reads μονος ει. However, the plate clearly shows c and the left portion of Υ.[105] The addition of συ or ει or συ ει would be natural,[106] and it appears that a number of scribes made such additions independently at different positions. What has happened in P^{47} is that the scribe has added συ, but has also omitted οσιος. This omission could have been by homoeoteleuton,[107] or perhaps P^{47} managed to transform οσιος into συ by a misreading or a conjecture.

Incidentally, the textual variation here could be divided so that the addition of συ would be treated separately from the presence of οσιος or αγιος. Under that way of viewing matters, P^{47} would have a singular omission of οσιος/αγιος. But it seems best to view these variations as parts of one larger variation. Nevertheless, P^{47} has the shortest reading (seven letters) of the readings reported here.

The following readings seem not to fit into any of the categories so far discussed: 11:13 (P^{47} goes against the parallel in Eze 38:19), 11:17c,[108] 14:15a, and 14:20. The remaining reading at 9:19 has perhaps arisen from the addition of final -ν,[109] with ην then taken as εαν.[110]

Summary.--The copying by the scribe of P^{47} is characterized by the following main features.

I. Although the amount of text preserved is rather limited, the scribe produces a high percentage of orthographic singulars and a fairly large percentage of nonsense singulars. Some errors were corrected by the scribe himself, perhaps in a few cases by means of a second exemplar.

II. Omissions are quite frequent, and in half the cases arise from a scribal leap.

III. Harmonization to the immediate context is quite frequent, and harmonization to parallels within Revelation accounts for the two transpositions in P^{47}.

IV. The scribe is concerned with grammatical and stylistic improvements, and consistently (in two cases with no support) prefers a singular verb with a neuter plural subject.

Addendum.--The reading at 16:10, treated above as an orthographic singular involving the addition of -ν, also involves the orthographic shift from ο to ω,[111] found only here among the singulars of P^{47}.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The datings in Aland, Repertorium, p. 277, are, besides Kenyon's, "III" and "III E." Kenyon's date is cited as "III E - IV," but this seems not quite accurate, since Kenyon says (Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text, p. xii): "There is nothing in the hand to suggest a later date than the third century, but it is likely to be late in the century."

[2] The extant leaves cover almost exactly the middle third of Revelation. Kenyon suggests that we have either the middle part of a single-quire codex, or the second quire of a three-quire codex (Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text, p. xi).

[3] Cf. ibid., and Aland, Repertorium, p. 277.

[4] Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text, p. xiii.

[5] Josef Schmid, Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes, 2. Teil: Die alten Stämme (Munich: Karl Zink, 1955), p. 146, #1. See also the earlier investigation by Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext des Chester Beatty Papyrus P^{47}," Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, 11 (1934), pp. 86-108.

[6] Studien, Die alten Stämme, pp. 109-10. Bousset had already noted the connection between א (for which Schmid uses "S") and Origen, as cited by Schmid; and R. V. G. Tasker, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Apocalypse of John," Journal of Theological Studies, 50 (1949), pp. 66-67, comments on the relation of P^{47} and Origen.

[7] Studien, Die alten Stämme, pp. 111-12. As Schmid notes, such readings would total about 110 if P^{47} were extant for the whole book.

[8] Ibid., p. 113.

[9] Cf. ibid., pp. X-XI.

[10] *Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text*, p. xii. By the way, on f. 4^{r} several letters are rewritten above the line: e.g. the τ of γαστρι in 12:2 and the κ of και later in the verse. Kenyon gives no explanation, and prints γασ^{τ}τρι but only και. The added letters appear to be by the scribe, and I believe that they are probably just attempts at clarifying letters rather than actual additions.

[11] *Ibid*.

[12] *Ibid*.

[13] Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," pp. 81-86, cites many of the singulars, but does not claim to be complete. He also considers quite a few non-singular readings.

[14] *Studien*, 1. Teil: *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia*, *Text* (Munich: Karl Zink, 1955).

[15] Kenyon reports (*Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text*, p. xiii) that P^{47} has "80 singular readings, and 27 which may be called sub-singular, in which it has support from a single minuscule or a very small group of them." The figure of 80 is followed by later writers, although Kenyon's apparatus actually cites 97 readings without continuous-text Greek manuscript support. Our list gives 74, and is based on Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Vol. III: *Revelation, Plates* (London: Emery Walker, 1936). The discrepancy is explained as follows:

Kenyon fails to note support for 27 readings: 9:14b, 9:20 (αυτων P^{47} cum ℵ [cf. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 1300]), 9:20c, 10:4d, 10:4e, 11:5, 11:5 (θελησει sec P^{47} cum 2020), 11:7b, 11:12b, 11:18b, 12:3, 12:4, 12:9b, 12:11a, 12:14b, 12:15, 12:16b, 13:4a, 13:5, 13:8 (αυτων P^{47} cum ℵ* 2040), 14:6, 14:13a, 14:13b, 14:15b, 15:7b, 16:8, 16:11.

He misreads as singular three readings which are supported: 13:3 (where P^{47} has εθαυμασθη cum A 1 pc), 14:15 (where P^{47} probably had το at the end of the line), and 16:10 (where P^{47} clearly has γλωσσας αυτων).

Kenyon misreads as non-singular three singular readings: 14:9a (where he prints προσκυνει), 15:4b (where he prints μονος ει), and 16:3 (where he prints απεθανεν). Also he fails to note 4 occurrences of δραπανον (14:15c, 14:16, 14:17b, 14:19a), pursuant to his note ad 14:14.

P^{47}'s κρισις at 16:7 may agree with 1611 (which has η κρισις), but it is more likely an itacism for αι] κρισεις, as in ℵ A C 181. Schmid thus interprets P^{47} ("Der Apokalypsetext," p. 82), and so this reading in Kenyon should be removed.

Kenyon has 1 variation at 10:4, where we count 3, and 2 readings at 13:15, where we count only 1.

A few other problems with Kenyon's edition are noted later in connection with specific readings.

[16] Kenyon does not indicate at all 11:17, 12:16, 13:3, or 16:14, and cites in his apparatus only 10:4, 13:16, 14:10, 15:3, and 16:11.

[17] That is, unless we were prepared to suppose that he first wrote την υναικι.

[18] Cf. BDF, §12, on the division of words, especially the examples from P^{46}.

[19] At both 11:10 and 13:16 two letters are erased, and even here the ink seems to be that of the scribe.

[20] Several papyri found at Oxyrhynchus have explicit indications of this kind of check; see E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 93 and n. 55.

[21] Several different omissions have occurred here in the various manuscripts.

[22] Nestle-Aland also reports P^{47} as just having ο κυριος, with no indication that this is P^{47c}.

[23] Moreover, the scribe also subsequently duplicated ο θ̅ς̅, thus creating the singular 11:17b.

[24] Cf. BDF, §45.

[25] On the itacisms in P^{47} see Kenyon, *Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text*, p. xii, as well as Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," pp. 81-82.

[26] Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 82, cites 12:2a, 12:14a, and 16:10 as obvious errors. He also cites 14:11 (which is corrected), 14:14b (which has support from 1955), and 13:5 (which has support from 2256).

[27] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 113.

[28] Hoskier cites 2070^{comm} as reading εσκοτωμενην here. However, this is not really an agreement with P^{47}, since the commentary has the word in the accusative; cf. Schmid, *Studien*, *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar*, *Text*, p. 170, line 11. The point of Hoskier's citation is that 2070^{txt} reads εσκοτισμενη here, in contrast to 2070^{comm}, which supports the -κοτωμ- of ς pm.

[29] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 130; note especially the first and last examples (under b), where προ- is written for προσ-.

[30] The verb προκυνεω is cited (on the basis of one occurrence) in LSJ, but would be nonsense here.

[31] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 132. We recall that P^{46} has five examples of this shift.

[32] *Ibid*., pp. 81-82; note the example of υφανδρα for υφαντρα.

[33] See BDF, §33, and Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 92.

[34] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 75-76.

[35] *Ibid*., pp. 123-24.

[36] *Ibid*., pp. 130-31; omission before μ is fairly well attested.

[37] *Ibid*., pp. 71-75.

[38] *Ibid*., pp. 244-46; here we have an unaccented occurrence before a nasal (p. 244).

[39] *Ibid*., pp. 239-40.

[40] *Ibid*., p. 286; this interchange is said to be "rare."

[41] Although Kenyon's transcription is correct, Nestle-Aland cites P^{47} as having -ξησει.

[42] *Ibid*., p. 288.

[43] Here we probably in fact have the result of the influence of the following αρνιω.

[44] The interchange of these two vowels occurs "frequently" (Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 278). For this direction see *ibid*., pp. 283-86.

[45] Cf. BDF, §29(1), and Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 82: "14,14-19 steht konsequent δραπανον für δρεπανον." Incidentally, to the other example cited in BDF (and also in LSJ) may be added one more (see LSJ, *Supplement*, *s.v.*). And the example of δραπανιδες cited in BDF from Hesychius should be (according to LSJ) δραπενιδες.

[46] Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 82, cites this (along with 10:3a and 12:2b) as "Konsonentenvertauschungen." Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 98-99, gives three examples of the interchange of χ and θ, and says: "Aspirates interchange rarely among themselves, probably through scribal error."

[47] Kenyon says of this reading: "Verba nonnulla repetita, fortasse a θαλασσαν priore." However, I believe that it is more likely that the scribe leaped back from εχοντας to νικωντας, thus writing:

> /τος αυτο]υ εστωτας επι την θαλασ
> /σαν την υελινην εχοντας εκ του θηριου και
> /της εικονος αυτου και εκ του αριθμου του
> /ονοματος α]υτου ε̣[στ]ωτας [επι την θαλασ
> /σαν κτλ.

In any case, though, it is clear that we have a long repetition, probably arising from a backwards leap, and it is likely that the resulting text was in fact nonsense.

[48] M.-J. Lagrange, "Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Épîtres de s. Paul et l'Apocalypse," *Revue biblique*, 43 (1934), p. 489, thinks that this may have been deliberate.

[49] Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 83, cites 11:17b and the nonsense reading 15:2 as dittographies. At 11:12b there appears to be a curious dittography, also found in 1611; see my "'Their Fifteen Enemies.'" Note too that the dittography at 11:17b could have been caused by a backwards leap from the ο before παντοκρατωρ to the ο before θ̅ς̅.

[50] P^{47} reads αυτας with 1849 for this αυτα (other manuscripts vary also), but it is nevertheless plausible (if not certain) that αυτα stood in P^{47}'s exemplar (or in his memory).

[51] See Schmid, *Studien*, *Die alten Stämme*, pp. 225-26, on Revelation's use of ως.

[52] I suppose that this could also be seen as an attempt at a stylistic improvement.

[53] The nonsense dittography at 15:2 adds (in my reconstruction) 21 words.

[54] Lagrange, "Les Papyrus," p. 489, cites 2 omissions by homoeoteleuton: 13:15 (he says 13:14, but this must be wrong), which he claims to be a leap from ινα to ινα, an impossible explanation; and 13:7, where P^{47} omits with A C P al. Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 83, cites 9:21, 11:2, 13:4b (as 13:14), and the nonsense 11:1. Schmid also cites 13:15, apparently as a leap from *του* pri to *θηριου* sec, but this would fail to explain the absence of και. Finally, Schmid cites 13:18 (where P^{47} agrees with 69) and 15:4b, which will be discussed below.

[55] In his edition Hoskier, following Horner, cites eth½ as reading *adorantes deos et daemones aureos*, and also eth½ as reading *daemones et deos*. Accordingly, for the omission of και (τα) ειδωλα, Hoskier cites: *sah* (*aeth*). But the presumed omission of this clause by eth, and its replacement with *deos*, are incorrect. Both editions of eth have (but in different positions) the term አማልክት, which may indeed render θεοι, but is also used to translate ειδωλα; see Dillmann, *Lexicon*, col. 152. So the Ethiopic provides no support at all for the reading of P^{47} here.

[56] J. Neville Birdsall, "Rev. xiii, 6," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 14 (1963), pp. 399-400, discusses this reading in P^{47}, and says of the omission of τους and σκηνουντας:

> "This is evidently an attempt at removing the phrase appositional to τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ which, with its mystical note, presents some exigetical difficulty. The addition of καὶ ante τοὺς found in many

> manuscripts and versions doubtless has its origin in a like attempt at a simplified text. The reading of P^{47} cannot be original since it is unacceptable on grounds of the author's style, according to which, if a prepositional phrase follows an articular noun, the article is regularly repeated."

Birdsall also comments on the versional evidence supporting the reading of P^{47}. Cf. Metzger, Commentary, pp. 748-49:

> "In view of occasional omissions in P^{47} the Committee regarded its reading ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ as a secondary modification, introduced probably because of the syntactical difficulty."

[57] I suppose that the reading of P^{47} comes by omission from the reading of ς 046 al. However, it is quite possible that P^{47}'s reading arises by addition from the reading of ℵ A P al.

[58] Cf. Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 83, who cites, besides 10:8 and 11:18a, also 14:13a (with support noted) as well as 14:15 and 14:19. However, at 14:15 the article was no doubt present at the end of the line, and at 14:19 Schmid fails to note that the article is clearly present in the photograph. In both of these cases, Kenyon's text is incorrect.

[59] Schmid, *ibid.*, also includes 16:10, where Kenyon misread P^{47} as omitting αυτων.

[60] Schmid, *ibid.* (and cf. *ibid.*, p. 90) cites 1773 as agreeing with P^{47} here. But his own edition of the Andreas commentary, which cites 1773 regularly, does not show this reading for 1773.

[61] I assume with Kenyon that P^{47} reads here ποιη[σαι], instead of, let us say, ποιη[σει]. This permits us to believe that the reading of P^{47} was more or less sensical, but postulates an additional change by the scribe after the omission. Incidentally, since this omission has no obvious cause (see note 54 above), it may be the case that our scribe has simply omitted one line of his exemplar.

[62] "Les Papyrus," p. 489.

[63] *Ibid*., pp. 489-90. Of course, if we considered only the "grands onciaux," the set of readings to be examined in P^{47} would be increased greatly.

[64] As we have seen (note 54) Lagrange does not give full credit to this possibility.

[65] We have seen this same tendency in both P^{45} and P^{46}.

[66] Cf. Hoskier's comment in *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse*, University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXIII (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1928), p. 3:

> "What has not been appreciated so far, perhaps, is the fact that the Apocalypse is especially exposed to the same kind of textual troubles which are so prevalent in the synoptic gospels, owing to the fact that phrases occur in repetition very frequently, so much so that ancient scribes or redactors accommodated and tried to harmonize the language throughout the book."

[67] Cf. also 15:8 and 17:17.

[68] See BDF, §472(1), and the remarks of Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3d edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 50-51.

[69] See Kenyon, *Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text*, p. xii; Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 82; and BDF, §46(1). On the spelling σαρκαν at Eph 5:31 in P^{46}, see Chapter III, note 271; cf. Jn 6:52 and 6:53 in P^{66} and 1 Pe 1:3c in P^{72}.

[70] Lagrange, "Les Papyrus," p. 491, refers (as point *b*) to the use of επι with the genitive at 10:1 (only A C $207\overline{5}$ have the accusative), 13:16 (μετωπων cum ς 046 pm), 14:9b (with about a dozen manuscripts), and 14:14 (cum ς ℵ C P 046 pm). The case of 14:9b is perhaps suggestive, but the other readings have too much support to be used safely as indicators of tendencies of our scribe.

[71] Cf. BDF, §428 (and [4] ad fin.), and Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2705, *d* and *g*.

[72] Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 85, notes the influence of ποιει in vs. 12 (actually three times in vss. 12-13).

[73] As Schmid, *ibid*., notes, this is influenced by θελωσιν at the end of 11:6 (according to P^{47} 2329 pc).

[74] Cf. 10:8, 11:18a, and 17:1 (the omissions of articles); 11:11 (the omission of και); the nonsense omission of one syllable at 12:16a; and 15:4c and 16:20 (the results of the grammatical rule to be discussed soon).

[75] See BDF, §153.

[76] The closest parallels are the occurrences of δοξάζω δόξῃ at 1 Macc 11:42, 14:29, and 14:39.

[77] See p. 145 above for this tendency in P^{45}; cf. BDF, §133, where P^{47}'s reading at Re 15:4c is cited.

[78] *Studien*, *Die alten Stämme*, 230-31.

[79] Cited *ibid*., p. 231. Note that μελλουσι is read by 2051 2064 2067. (Here ℵ* 1828 have δει μελλειν, C pc have δει μελλει, and 2050 has δει. However, the presence of δει is to be explained by the influence of 1:1, 4:1, and 22:6, as noted by Schmid, *ibid*., p. 98.)

[80] Schmid, *ibid*., p. 231, says: "Bemerkenswert ist aber, dass in der Textüberlieferung nach beiden Richtungen korrigiert wurde." Several examples of each type of "correction" are cited *ibid*., pp. 230-31 and 231 n. 3.

[81] These are, I believe, all the relevant readings. Lagrange, "Les Papyrus," p. 491, point *a*, cites 11:18, 15:4, and 16:20. Schmid ("Der Apokalypsetext," pp. 83-84, and *Studien*, *Die alten Stämme*, p. 231 n. 3) also cites 9:18 απεκτανθησαν: -θη P^{47} al in this connection. But since the subject here is το τριτον, this hardly comes under the rule now being discussed. Rather, the use of the plural verb is a *constructio ad sensum*, as Schmid himself notes on p. 231 (cf. also BDF, §134[1]).

[82] See Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §950, and BDF, §134.

[83] As is the case in it^{h} arm^{1}. A clear example, by the way, of how coincidental agreements can arise in translations is given by comparing it^{h} (animae quae erant viventes . . . mortui sunt) and Luther's version (alle lebendige Wesen . . . starben). Of course, neither of these really supports P^{47}, since they shift the verb *and* subject.

[84] See Schmid, *Studien*, *Die alten Stämme*, pp. 231-32.

[85] Metzger, *Commentary*, pp. 757-58, says: "The plural number, with or without οἱ, appears to have been introduced in order to avoid the repetition of ἐγένετο (just as 046 and 120 minuscules omit the first ἐγένετο for the same reason)." This is possible, although it seems to me more likely that 046 pm omitted εγενετο pri because they construed σεισμος μεγας as one of the subjects of εγενοντο pri.

[86] *Ibid*., p. 757.

[87] *Studien*, *Die alten Stämme*, p. 92.

[88] Cf. the remark of Lagrange, "Les Papyrus," p. 492: "Enfin voici un cas bizarre: XVI, 18 ανθρωπος εγενοντο, fusion de ανθρωποι εγενοντο de ℵ et -ος -ετο de A. Le pap. a donc déjà une leçon composée?" That such a reading, though, could be conflate seems very improbable.

[89] I have, however, again failed to find a parallel to this construction.

[90] It is conceivable that P^{47} could just have misread ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΙ as ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟϹ, but, especially in the light of 16:3, I believe that the origin suggested above is more likely.

[91] "Les Papyrus," p. 491; his evidence is on pp. 491-92.

[92] For examples see note 70 above.

[93] "Les Papyrus," p. 490.

[94] Besides the quotation in note 66 above, see also the long remark by Hoskier to the same effect in *Text*, p. xiii.

[95] It is barely possible that a parallel in the Gospel of John played a role in 14:15e, to be discussed in the final section.

[96] Lagrange, overlooking the influence of the context here, suggested ("Les Papyrus," p. 489) that P^{47}'s reading might have "le sens de suivre des yeux," and cited Sophocles' *Ajax* 5 for this meaning. Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 85, says of 11:12: "Einfluss von 11,1 f?"

[97] Cf. BDF, §147, on the use of the nominative for the vocative. Schmid, *Studien*, *Die alten Stämme*, p. 205, says that the vocative is rare in Revelation, but is met "besonders in der Wendung κυριε ο θεος (11,17; 15,3; 16,7)." Note that 296 2200 replace κυριε at 15:3 by κυριος.

[98] Lagrange, "Les Papyrus," p. 489 n. 2, confuses the two occurrences, saying of Kenyon's signalling of a singular reading: "Mais c'est bien la leçon commune." Kenyon's note is indeed ambiguous, but his text is not.

[99] As noted by Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 85.

[100] Horner cites only two manuscripts at this text.

[101] At least this seems a more reasonable explanation than that the reading found in 2053 (a thirteenth century manuscript) actually stood in the *Vorlage* of P^{47} a thousand years earlier.

[102] On the interchange of δ and τ, see Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 80-83. Gignac gives no example of the interchange of δδ and ττ, but the frequent simplification of doubled consonants and gemination of single consonants (*ibid*., pp. 154-62) would suggest that these interchanges would not greatly differ.

On the aphaeresis of ἀ- (here after εβραιστι), see *ibid*., pp. 320-21. Cf. also the variation at Re 16:16 between αρμαγεδ(δ)ων and μαγεδ(δ)ων.

[103] *Ibid*., p. 63, point 5.

[104] Hoskier reports that this leap has occurred (with the resulting omission) in sah⅓ Tyc 3.

[105] One may compare the Υ in the line below and the ϵι in the third line below.

[106] See the ancient versions cited by Hoskier, as well as the various English versions.

[107] Schmid, "Der Apokalypsetext," p. 83, refers to the omission of οσιος by homoeoteleuton after μονος. One could thus explain Kenyon's text as arising by a leap from the reading of 1773 2019 pc. But, unfortunately, no manuscript has μονος οσιος συ.

[108] Lagrange, "Les Papyrus," p. 489, says that "την μενουσαν est tellement plus expressif que την μεγαλην!"

[109] Here we have the addition before a stop (see Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 113). However, in this case the stop is γ, while in the two cases examined earlier (12:2a and 16:10) the stop was κ.

[110] Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2283, says: "ἤν appears in Ionic and in the older Attic writers." BDF, §107, comments that "ἐάν, not ἤν or ἄν, is the Hell. form for 'if.'" One finds at the same place references to manuscript variation with αν, but none with ην (and cf. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 96). Nevertheless, this way of construing the reading of P^{47} seems to be the only one which makes sense.

[111] See Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 277.

CHAPTER V

THE SCRIBE OF P^{66}

P^{66} is a codex dating from about 200,[1] which originally contained the entire Gospel of John.[2] The papyrus, which was paginated, is well preserved from Jn 1:1 to 14:26 (pages 1-108), except for a lacuna of two folios (pages 35-38) containing Jn 6:11 to 6:35.[3] More or less well preserved portions of pages 109-154 (Jn 14:29 - 21:9) are also extant.[4] There are also 39 "fragments non placés" included in the edition, of which six have subsequently been located.[5] Apart from one folio (pages 139-40) in the Chester Beatty collection at Dublin, the remains of P^{66} are in the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana at Cologny-Geneva, and are known as Papyrus Bodmer II.

Studies of P^{66} have been severely handicapped by certain problems in the editio princeps. The editor, Victor Martin, published the material from Jn 1:1 to 14:26 rather quickly, and, apparently as a consequence of this speed, the edition suffers from numerous errors, particularly in the treatment of scribal corrections. Since the first reports on P^{66} were dependent on Martin's transcription, such work is necessarily incorrect in various details. The subsequent

UMI

publication by Martin of the remaining material, and then a revised publication by Martin and J. W. B. Barns of this material with some additions, seem to have been of higher quality. The publication of photographs with this latter revision finally made it possible to control in detail the editions.

Also to be regretted is the inadequacy of the apparatus attached to the *editio princeps*. Presumably singular readings are underlined by Martin in the apparatus,[6] but in fact Martin relied, as we find, solely upon Souter's second edition.[7] The occasional slips which were noted in Kenyon's *apparatus critici* for the three Chester Beatty papyri pale, of course, in significance beside what we thus find presented in the apparatus for P^{66}. In short, this apparatus is worthless for understanding the textual relationships of P^{66}.

In the later publication of the rest of P^{66}, Martin alters his method so as to utilize the twenty-third edition of Nestle-Aland (1957) and Tischendorf's eighth edition.[8] However, the indications of singulars must still be handled with care.[9] And in the revised edition of this material, the underlining for singulars has disappeared; what remains is merely an indication of divergence from the text of the twenty-fourth edition of Nestle-Aland (1960).[10]

The result is that our list of singulars cannot rely on the textual notes in the edition. Fortunately, however, several scholars have made corrections to the edited readings, and all of these have been collected (and augmented) by Fee.[11] A few additional corrections are presumed in the present list of singulars.[12]

Studies of the textual affinities of P^{66} have shown that it is a "mixed text," with Alexandrian readings, Western readings, and Byzantine readings. The careful analysis by Fee produced the conclusion that P^{66} contains a basically Alexandrian text, but with "a profusion of readings from the Western tradition and other, chiefly secondary, readings of the type found later in the Byzantine tradition."[13] This mixture and an examination of the support found in von Soden made it reasonable to collate our preliminary list of singulars against W, Θ, 892, and 1241, as well as against the overlapping portions of P^{45} and P^{75}. This check enabled us to remove five readings,[14] and (as usual) to correct a few citations.

The most reliable list of singular readings of P^{66} appears to consist of the combination of the several lists compiled by Fee in the course of his study. These include 18 uncorrected "simple scribal errors,"[15] and 7 corrections "where P^{66c} reads alone against the rest."[16] Moreover, in his Appendix D ("Some Notations on Orthography") Fee assembles valuable data on orthographic variations within P66.[17] The readings cited there involving confusions of ι/ει and αι/ε have been ignored in our collation, and the two examples of η for ει are both supported.[18] However, of Fee's 6 examples of ο for ω 2 are singular.[19] And in his discussion of the writing of second aorists, Fee includes 9 readings which are singular.[20]

Moreover, in his Appendix B ("370 Variants where P^{66} Differs from the Neutral Tradition") Fee notes, under seven categories, variations of P^{66} from the Neutral manuscripts, with the singular or sub-singular readings of P^{66} listed at the end of each category.[21] Fee there cites 76 readings without continuous-text Greek manuscript support, but 7 of these in fact have support.[22] On the other hand, Fee misses 24 singulars which we include,[23] and there are a few other discrepancies between our list and his lists.[24] As a result, we have 129 singular readings in P^{66}, and they are as follows.

UMI

John

1:4 εν ς rell : om P^{66}

(o) 1:8 αλλ ς rell : αλλα P^{66}

** 1:13 αλλ ς rell : αλλα P^{66} W^{supp}

1:17 χαρις και ς rell : χαρ[ις] δε και P^{66} it syr^{h**} : δε χαρις και W^{supp}

1:21 τι ουν συ ηλιας ει P^{75} C* Ψ 33 pc it$^{ff^2,l}$ Or : τις ουν συ ηλειας ει P^{66} : τι ουν ηλιας ει ℵ L 0141 it^{a} syr^{p} : συ ουν τι ηλειας ει B : τι ουν ηλιας ει συ ς C^{3} rell (945 add ο ante ηλιας) : τι ουν συ ει ηλιας W^{supp} : συ τις ει ηλιας ει 1071 : συ τι ουν ηλιας ει 1170

** 1:27a αξιος ς rell : ικανος P^{66} P^{75} 472

** 1:27b αυτου post λυσω ς rell : αυτ̣[ου] post υποδηματος P^{66} 185

1:50 υποκατω της συκης ς rell : υπο την συκην P^{66}

(o) 2:11 της ς rell : τη P^{66}

** 3:4 ανθρωπος γεννηθηναι ς pm : γεννηθηναι ανθρωπος P^{66} 245 1223 pc

(n) 3:6 γεγεννημενον ς rell (A H Θ al -ν-) : γεγεγεννημενον P^{66}

** 3:21 ειργασμενα ς pm : ηργασμενα P^{66} Θ

(o) 3:27 η ς rell : ην P^{66}

** 3:28 ειπον ς pm : ειπο̄ (= ειπον) οτι P^{66} P^{75} 485 700 it$^{aur,e,f,ff^2,l}$

John

** 3:31 ανωθεν ς rell : ανοθεν P^{66c} W^{supp} : ανοθ P^{66*}

3:33 εσφρα[γι]σεν ς P^{66*} rell : ουτος εσφρα[γι]σεν P^{66c2} : τουτον εσφρα[γι]σεν P^{66c1}

4:14 εν αυτω πηγη ς rell (πιγη Θ, 270 pc om εν) : πηγη εν αυτω P^{66}

** 4:23 προσκυνουντας ς rell (-νησαντας 482*) : προσκυνουτας P^{66} W^{supp}

(o) 4:31 μεταξυ ς rell : μετοξυ P^{66}

(n) 4:36 ο θεριζων sec ς rell : θεριζων P^{66}

(o) 4:39 μαρτυρουσης ς rell (Θ -σις) : ματυρουσης P^{66c} : (ειπο)υσης P^{66*}(?) 185 syr^{c,p}

5:2 βηθσαιδα P^{75} B W^{supp} 0125 pc it^{aur,c} vg syr^{h} cop eth Tert : βηδσαιδα P^{66c} : βηδσαιδαν P^{66*} : βησσαιδα Ψ : βηθεσδα ς rell : βηθζαθα ℵ 33 it^{l} : βηζαθα L it^{e} : βελζεθα D it$^{a,d,r^1}$

5:6 χρονον εχει ς rell (P^{75} f^{1} 213 482 565 pon ηδη post χρονον) : εχει χρονον P^{66}

** 5:19 αν (post γαρ) ς pm : εαν P^{66} 1071 1321

5:30 δυναμαι ς rell : δυνομαι P^{66}

5:36 ο πατηρ sec ς rell : $\overline{\text{πηρ}}$ (= πατηρ) P^{66} : εκεινος 1241

5:43 με ς P^{66*} rell : om P^{66c}

John

6:52 σαρκα ς rell : σαρκα̅ (= σαρκαν) P^{66}

6:53 σαρκα ς rell : σαρκαν P^{66}

6:61 αυτοις ς rell : αυτοις ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) P^{66}

** 6:62 θεωρητε ς pm : θεωρησηται P^{66} 213

(o) 6:65 η ς rell : ην P^{66}

6:69 ο αγιος του θεου P^{75} ℵ B C* D L W it^{d} cop$^{sa^{ms},bo^{ms}}$:
ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου C^{3} Θ* f^{1} 33 565 1010
it vg syr^{s} arm geo^{1} : ο χ̅ς̅ (= χριστος) ο αγιος
του θ̅υ̅ (= θεου) P^{66} cop$^{sa^{mss},bo,ach^{2}}$:
ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου του ζωντος ς Δ (om
του sec) Θ^{c} rell it$^{f(man\ 1),ff^{2},q,r^{1}}$ syr^{p,h,pal}
cop$^{bo^{mss}}$ goth eth^{pp} geo^{B} : ο υιος του θεου του
ζωντος 17 geo^{A} : ο υιος του θεου it^{b} syr^{c} :
ο χριστος Tert : ο χριστος ο αγιος ο υιος
του θεου του ζωντος eth^{ro}

6:70 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους ς P^{75} rell (69 pc
αυτω pro αυτοις) : απεκριθη αυτοις ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους)
P^{66} : απεκριθη αυτοις E F G Γ Δ Λ 28 1424 pm :
απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις ℵ (N 1187 ο
ιησους) : απεκριθη ο ιησους λεγων D

7:3a ειπον ς rell : ειπαν P^{66}

(o) 7:3b θεωρησωσι ς B^{3} rell : θεορησωσι P^{66} :
θεωρησουσι P^{75} ℵ^{c} B* D L M N W Δ 0105 0250 33
1424 al : θεωρουσιν ℵ* : θεασωνται 1010 1293

John

	7:8	ουπω (ante πεπληρωται) ς rell : ουδεπω P^{66}
	7:24	μη κρινετε ς rell (V 69 543 1241 -ατε, θ -ητε) : μη κρινε P^{66}
	7:27	ο δε χριστος ς rell (θ χρηστος) : ο $\overline{\text{χς}}$ (= χριστος) δε P^{66} : ο δε ο χριστος A : ο χριστος ℵ it^{e} : χριστος 565
	7:28	ουν ς rell : δε P^{66} it$^{ff^{2}}$
	7:30	ουπω ς rell : ουδεπω P^{66}
	7:35	ειπον ς rell : ειπαν P^{66}
**	7:36	ειπεν ς rell : ειπεν οτι P^{66} 983 1689
	7:45	ηλθον ς rell : ηλθαν P^{66}
(n)	8:20	ρηματα ς rell : ρητα P^{66}
	8:25a	ελεγον ουν ς rell : και ελεγον P^{66} : ελεγον ℵ Γ 249 pc : ειπον ουν W 245 1187
	8:25b	την ς P^{66*} rell (047 om την αρχην) : ειπον ụμιν την P^{66c}
	8:26	εχω ς rell : εχων P^{66} it^{e}
	8:28	ουδεν ς rell : ουδε εν P^{66}
	8:36	εσεσθε ς rell : εστε P^{66} : γενησεσθε 1241
	8:42a	εγω γαρ εκ ς rell (παρα pro εκ 579, G om εκ του θεου) : εκ γαρ P^{66}
	8:42b	εξηλθον ς rell : εξεληλυθα P^{66}
	8:42c	απεστειλεν ς rell : απεσταλκεν P^{66}
**	8:51	θεωρηση (vel -σει) ς rell : ιδη P^{66} 1093

John

** 8:55 εσομαι ομοιος υμων ς pm : εσομαι υμω̄ (= υμων) ομοιος P^{66} f^{13}

9:4 δυναται ς rell : δυνη[σε]ται P^{66vid} pr sp it^{b}

9:10 ειπον D : ειπαν P^{66} : ελεγον ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell (ℵ* ελεγαν)

9:16a ανθρωπος sec ς rell : om P^{66vid} pr sp

(o) 9:16b σχισμα ς rell : σχιμα P^{66}

** 9:28a δε (sec, post ημεις) ς pm : γαρ P^{66} 348 1216 syr^{p}

9:28b του ς rell : om P^{66}

** 9:29 ημεις ς rell : ημεις δε P^{66} pc

9:30 εν τουτω γαρ P^{75} ℵ B L W Θ Ψ 22 579 1071 pc : εν γαρ τουτω ς rell (τουτο X Λ al) : τουτο γαρ P^{66} (it^{e} hoc ergo) : εν τουτω ουν D $it^{d,r1}$ syr^{p}

(o) 9:31 η ς rell : η̄ (= ην) P^{66}

** 9:33 θεου ς pm : θ̅υ̅ (= θεου) ο α̅ν̅ο̅ς̅ (= ανθρωπος) P^{66} Θ (sed om ουτος) N pc

** 9:34 εξεβαλον ς rell : εξεβαλαν P^{66} W

9:35 εξεβαλον ς rell : εξεβαλαν P^{66}

9:37 εκεινος ς rell : αυτος P^{66} it vg

(n) 9:40 ημεις ς rell : υμεις P^{66}

10:3 προβατα sec ς rell : προβατια P^{66} $it^{b,q}$

John

10:16 αγαγειν ς rell : συναγαγειν P^{66} Cl^{pt}

** 10:21 αλλοι ς rell : αλλοι δε P^{66} ℵ Θ f^{13} 1093 1242 it^{d} $syr^{s,p}$ (W ελεγον δε αλλοι)

10:31 λιθασωσιν αυτον ς rell : αυτον λιθασωσιν P^{66}

** 10:32 δια ποιον ς pm : δια ποιον ουν P^{66} W cop^{bo} Epiph

10:34 αυτοις ο ιησους ς P^{75} rell : αυτοις ιησους P^{45} B W : αυτοις ο ιησους και ειπεν D : $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ (= ιησους) και ειπεν αυτοις P^{66} : αυτοις f^{13pt}

** 10:40a παλιν ς rell : om P^{66} Γ 047 213 245 440 1355 it^{e} $syr^{s,p}$

** 10:40b οπου ς rell : ου P^{66} 047

11:4 του θεου sec ς rell : om P^{66} : αυτου P^{45} $it^{c,ff^2,l}$ cop^{sa,ach^2} syr^{s} Ambr : του ανθρωπου 0250

** 11:14 ο ιησους ς pm : $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ (= ιησους) P^{66} ℵ* (sed suppl o ipse ℵ* ut vid) pc

11:17 ηδη post ημερας ς A^{2} C^{3} rell : ηδη ante ημερας P^{75} B C* Θ f^{13} 397 472 1223 pc : ηδη ante τεσσαρες P^{66} it^{a,ff^2,g,l,p,r^1} vg^{ms} goth : om ηδη A* D 237

11:20 οικω αυτης 2768 : οικω εαυτης P^{66} : οικω ς rell

John

** 11:22 αιτηση vel αιτησει ς rell : αιτησης P^{66} P^{45} W pc

11:25 ο ιησους ς rell : [$\overline{ις}$] (= ιησους) P^{66vid} pr sp

11:27 κυριε ς rell (A ο ιησους pro ναι κυριε) : $\overline{κε}$ (= κυριε) πιστευω P^{66}

** 11:30 εν ς rell : επι P^{66} P^{45} Θ f^{13} pc

11:31 ταχεως ανεστη ς rell : ανεστη ταχεως P^{66}

** 11:32 ιδουσα ς rell : και ιδουσα P^{66} P^{45vid} : ιδουσα δε W

11:33 συνεληλυθοτας αυτη P^{45} 440 660 : συνεληλυθοτας μετ αυτης D it : συνεληλυθοτας συν αυτη P^{66} : συνελθοντας αυτη ς P^{75} $W^{c(man\ 2)}$ rell : συνελθοντας W* 1354 : συν αυτη ελθοντας 954

(n) 11:35 εδακρυσεν ς rell : εδρακυσεν P^{66}

(n) 11:38 εν εαυτω ς rell (F om εν) : εν εαυ/αυτω P^{66}

11:39 κυριε ς rell : om P^{66}

** 11:40 οτι ς rell : om P^{66} 69

** 11:49 τις ς rell : om P^{66} 1071 1241

** 11:54a ιησους ουν ς pm : ο δε $\overline{ις}$ (= ιησους) P^{66} 1187 it^{f,r^1} syr^p

11:54b εις sec ς rell : om P^{66} it^d syr^s

12:2a εποιησαν ς rell : εποιησεν P^{66}

** 12:2b η μαρθα διηκονει ς pm : μαρθα διηκονει P^{66} 0218^{vid}

John

** 12:9a οχλος πολυς ς P^{66*} pm : ο οχλος ο πολυς P^{66c} W 0250 1010

** 12:9b εκ pri ς rell : om P^{66} W 0250 579 1365

12:11 υπηγον et και επιστευον ς rell (απηγον 579, επιστευσαν 69) : επιστευσαν (post ιουδαιων) P^{66}

(o) 12:12 ο οχλος ο πολ·λυς Θ : ο οχλος ο πολυς P^{66c} : ο οχλος πολυς P^{66*} B L f^{13} 892^{supp} al : οχλος πολυς ς rell : οχλος 33 2768

12:13 ελαβον ς rell : ελαβαν P^{66} : ελαβοντο 124

12:22 ανδρεας τε και φιλιππος Θ^{c} (Θ* -ιπος) : ανδρεας δε και φιλιππος P^{66c} it^{c,l} : και παλιν ο ανδρεας δε και ο φιλιππος P^{66*} it$^{b,ff^{2}}$: και (om D 1321) παλιν (add ο D 1321, add και H) ανδρεας (add τε 1170) και (add ο W) φιλιππος (add και X 1071 2768) ς rell : ερχεται ανδρεας και φιλιππος και P^{75vid} A B L pc it^{a} (ℵ 157 praem και παλιν, 54 1241 praem και, 249 praem παλιν)

** 12:26 και εαν ς rell : εαν δε P^{66c} 579 it$^{b,c,l,r^{1}}$: εαν (sec) P^{66*} P^{75} ℵ B D L W X Θ Ψ f^{1} f^{13} 33 565 892 1241 al

** 12:29 λελαληκεν ς rell : ελαλησεν P^{66} 1241

** 12:47 πιστευση ς pm : φυλαξη αυτα P^{66} 1689 it$^{c,r^{1}}$ syr^{s,p}

John

** 12:48 εν ς rell : om P^{66} 1241 (et Tischendorf per errorem)

13:1a ηλθεν א A B K L M W X Θ Π Ψ 0124 f^{1} f^{13} 33 565 892 1241 al : εληλυθεν ς rell : ηκει P^{66} : παρην D

13:1b του κοσμου τουτου ς rell : τουτου του κοσμου P^{66}

13:2a γενομενου ς $א^{c}$ rell : γεναμενου P^{66} : γινομενου א* B L W X Ψ 0124 1241 pc

13:2b σιμωνος ς rell : σιμωννος P^{66}

13:5 νιπτηρα ς rell : ποδονιπτηρα P^{66} : νιπτην 346

** 13:16 μειζων sec ς rell : μιζον P^{66c} W (μειζον) : om P^{66*}

(n) 13:19a απ αρτι λεγω υμιν προ ς P^{66c}(man 2) rell (1241 om υμιν, 71 om προ του γενεσθαι) : om P^{66*}

(o) 13:19b εγω ειμι ς rell : εγωμι P^{66} : εγω ειπον υμιν f^{1} f^{13pt} 713 1293

13:24 λεγει sec ς P^{66*} rell : ειπεν P^{66c} it^{e}

13:33 αρτι πλην 1 138 565 660 1071 1582 : πλην αρτι P^{66} syr^{s} : αρτι ς rell

13:34 αγαπατε αλληλους sec ς rell : αλληλους αγαπαται P^{66}

13:35a εμοι ς rell : εμου P^{66}

13:35b μαθηται εστε ς rell : εσται μαθηται P^{66c} : εσται αθηται P^{66*}

** 14:2 τοπον υμιν ς rell : υμειν τοπον P^{66} 1170 1424 $it^{a,b,c,e,f,ff^{2},r^{1}}$ vg

John

**	14:14	εγω ς P^{66*} pm : τουτο εγω P^{66c} 1241
	14:19	δε ς rell : om P^{66} it^{a}
	14:22	αυτω ς rell : προς αυτον P^{66} : om Λ 397
	14:26	πεμψει ς P^{66*} rell (L Λ 29* -ψη, 579 πεμψας με pro πεμψει ο) : πεμψει υμιν P^{66c} syr^{s}
	15:4	ουδε (και X 213 pc) υμεις εαν μη εν εμοι μεινητε ς rell (μενητε ℵ A B L Θ* 579, μεινητε εν εμοι 33 543 1093) : κα[ι ο ε]ν εμοι μενων P^{66}
	15:6	βαλλουσιν ς rell : βαλλ̣ου̣σ̣ι̣ν̣ [αυ]τ̣α P^{66} : εμβαλουσιν 33
	15:8	πολυν ς rell : πλιονα P^{66}
	15:12	καθως ς rell : ως P^{66}
	15:13	αυτου pri ς rell (εαυτου 579 2145) : την εαυτου P^{66}
	15:15	ειρηκα ς rell : λ̣εγ̣ω̣ P^{66}
	15:18	μισει ς rell : εμισει P^{66c} : εμισησε P^{66*}
**	15:19a	το ιδιον ς rell : τον ιδιον P^{66} 1241
	15:19b	εκ του κοσμου ουκ εστε ς rell (D* ητε pro ουκ εστε) : ουκ εκ του κοσμου̣ εστε P^{66c} : ουκ εκ τουτου του κοσμου̣ εστε P^{66*} it
	15:19c	μισει υμας ς rell : υμας μισει P^{66} $it^{a,q}$
	15:21	ποιησουσιν ς rell : ποιουσ̣ιν P^{66} it : ποιησωσιν Δ 33 1241 pc
	15:24	ουδεις ς rell : μηδ[εις] P^{66}
**	16:19	μετ (επ 482) αλληλων ς rell : [προς αλληλ]ο̣υς P^{66} N

John

16:32 ιδου ς rell : [ι]δ̣ε P^{66vid}

16:33 ταυτα ς rell : τ̣αυτα δε P^{66}

17:3 απεστειλας ς rell (-λεν W) : [επ]εμψας P^{66vid}

17:5 ειχον et ειναι παρα σοι ς rell :
ε̣ιχον πα[ρ]α̣ σ̣οι et ειναι P^{66*} D it^{a,d,f} syr^{p} :
ε̣ιχον πα[ρ]α̣ σ̣οι et ειναι πα[ρα σοι] P^{66c}

17:6 του κοσμου ς rell : [το]υτο̣υ̣ του κοσμου P^{66} it^{a,b,d,f,q}

17:9 ερωτω pri ς rell : om P^{66}

17:11 αυτοι ℵ B 229** 1241 pc it^{d,f} : ουτοι ς rell : om P^{66vid} pr sp

17:16 εκ [το]υ̣ [κ]οσμου ουκ ε̣[ι]σ̣ιν καθως (add εγω ς rell) [ε]κ το[υ] κο[σ]μ̣ο̣υ̣ ου[κ ειμι] ς P^{66*} rell : om P^{66c} : εκ (add τουτου D) του κοσμου ουκ εισιν καθως εγω (καγω D 69 97) ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου ℵ A B C D L W X al : om versus 15 et 16 33 225 397 cop$^{bo^{mss}}$

17:18 καγω απεστειλα (Λ* αποστειλα, f^{13} αποστελλω) αυτους εις τον κοσμον ς rell (αυτους απεστειλα 2145) : om P^{66vid} pr sp

17:24 ειμι εγω ς rell : [εγω ει]μι P^{66}

(o) 17:26 η καγω ς rell : η̣ν κ[αγω] P^{66} :
ειη καγω 477 : η και εγω W

** 18:10 αυτου ante το pri ς rell : αυτου ante τ̣ο̣ sec P^{66} 544 it$^{b,e,f,ff^{2},r^{1}}$

John

18:16a γνωστος ς rell : γνω̣τος P^{66} : γνωριμος N

(o) 18:16b θυρωρω ς rell : θυρουρω P^{66c} : θυρω P^{66*}

(o) 18:17 θυρωρος ς rell : [θυρο]υρος P^{66}

18:25 ειπον ς rell : [ε]ι̣πα̣ν P^{66} : ειπεν Λ 1187

** 18:27 ευθεως ς rell : [ευ]θ̣υς P^{66} W

18:30 σοι post αν ς rell : σο[ι] ante [αυτον] P^{66}

18:31 λαβετε ς rell : [λαβετ]ε̣ ο̣υν P^{66} it$^{a,r^1}$ syr^{s}

(n) 18:34 αλλοι ειπον σοι B C* D^{supp} L W pc :
[αλ]λοι ε̣[ι]πεν σο[ι] P^{66} : αλλοι σοι ειπον
ς C^{3} Π^{2} rell : αλλος σοι ειπεν M (αλλο) N S
Π^{*,3} al : αλλος 185 pc

18:35 μη ℵ* W f^{1} 565 pc : μητι ς ℵ^{c} rell :
μη γαρ P^{66}

18:36 του κοσμου τουτου sec ς rell :
[τουτου του κ]ο̣σμου P^{66}

18:37 ιησους ς rell : ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) κ[α]ι ειπ̣εν
P^{66} syr^{pal}

18:38a λεγει pri ς rell : λεγει ου̣ν̣ P^{66}

** 18:38b ο πειλατος vel ο πιλατος ς rell :
πειλατος P^{66} 28*

John

18:38c ουδεμιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν B L X 0109 213 249 579 954 1321 : ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω ς rell (Y* 054* om εν αυτω, sed Y suprascriptum habet et ante αιτιαν et post ευρισκω) : ουδεμιαν ευ[ρισκ]ω̣ αι̣[τι]α̣ν̣ εν αυτω P^{66} it^{f} : ουδεμιαν αιτιαν εν αυτω ευρισκω D^{supp} 1170 1242 : εν αυτω αιτιαν ουδεμιαν ευρισκω 299

19:2 στεφανον εξ ακανθων ς rell : εξ [α]κανθω̣ν̣ σ̣τ̣εφ̣α̣νον̣ P^{66}

19:6 και sec ς rell : om P^{66}

19:13 λεγομενον ante λιθοστρωτον ς rell (επιλεγ- 346) : [λεγομενο]¯ (= λεγομενον) post δε P^{66vid} : ος λεγεται ante λιθοστρωτον 1 565 pc

19:32 ηλθον ς rell : ηλθαν P^{66}

19:38 και επετρεψεν (add αυτω f^{13pt}) ο πειλατος (A B* D^{supp}, πιλατος ς B^{3} rell) ς rell : om P^{66vid}

** 20:15 αυτον αρω ς rell : [αρ]ω α̣[υτον] P^{66} W

20:18 εωρακα ℵ B N W X 1071 (892^{supp} ?) : εορακα P^{66} (892^{supp} ?) : εωρακαμεν S 33 : εωρακεν vel εορακεν ς rell

John

21:2 διδυμος ς rell : δ[ι]δ̣υ̣μου P^{66}

** 21:6a δι ολης της νυκτος ℵ^{ca} Cyr (it^{g} vg^{mss} cop^{sa}
eth) : δι ολης νυκτος P^{66} Ψ : om ς ℵ^{*,cb} rell

21:6b ρηματι ℵ^{ca} Ψ it^{g} vg^{mss} cop^{sa} eth :
[ο]νομ[ατι] P^{66} Cyr : om ς ℵ^{*,cb} rell

Of these 129 singulars, 14 are orthographic singulars and 8 are nonsense singulars. Thus, we are left with 107 significant singulars.

Corrections.--One of the most striking features of P^{66} is the quantity of corrections. I have counted 440,[25] although it is sometimes uncertain whether a correction has been made,[26] and is of course also often uncertain what the corrected reading was.[27] However, there is no doubt that the text was subjected to very frequent correction, and that, in at least most cases, the scribe himself was the corrector. Martin says:

> la réparation de ces très nombreuses omissions était selon toute probabilité due au scribe original. En tout cas rien n'oblige à les attribuer à une autre main.[28]

Similar comments have been made by Aland[29] and Fee.[30] However, in the case of some corrections--particularly those which are simply deletions effected by scraping or marking with dots--a judgment is virtually impossible to make, and Martin leaves open the possibility of another hand being involved.[31]

Indeed, Fee calls attention to one correction which "seems clearly to be the work of a second hand": 13:19a.[32] Here απ αρτι λεγω υμιν προ is added between the lines, and Fee correctly notes the quite different υ and μ, saying that they "simply demand a second hand."[33] This appears to be the only case in the papyrus where a second hand is clearly at work, and it is certainly not accidental that this correction is of a lengthy omission which produces nonsense.

There are, though, 8 cases in the papyrus of a two-stage correction, and we might well think that in such cases someone other than the scribe is likely to have been involved. These 8 corrections are: 3:33, 4:47, 5:28a, 5:39, 7:41, 13:7, 13:10c, and 14:12a.[34] Rhodes cites all but the first and third of these, and says that these "are the instances of correction where more than one hand may be detected."[35] Rhodes believes that these corrections occurred in a sequence which suggests (at least) that different tendencies were involved in the first corrections and in the later corrections of these corrections. He deduces from the evidence that two reviews of the manuscript were undertaken. The first was "a preliminary check" to remove orthographic irregularities and to make the text read sensibly. The second utilized another exemplar to ensure "transcriptional accuracy."[36] These two reviews can perhaps still be seen in these two-stage corrections, and it is significant that in all six of Rhodes' examples (as well as 5:28a) the eventual reading is the majority reading.[37] It happens, though, that in none of these two-stage corrections do we find any discernible differences in the handwriting,[38] and so it remains doubtful, as Rhodes points out,[39] whether we have here the results of two (or more) checks by the scribe himself, or of the scribe and a corrector, or of one or more correctors. The absence of any correction other than that at 13:19a which is clearly in another hand shows that the corrections by anyone other than the scribe must have been rather limited. In any case, I have assumed in the lists of corrections and of singulars that only 13:19a is by a second hand.

In connection with this topic it may be noted that, on the basis of the plates originally published by Martin in 1956, Aland suggested that P^{66} was written by two different scribes. Aland pointed out that the letter β on page 1 is rather different from that found in Jn 11:33 (on page 79), and says (citing Wilhelm Schubart): "im späteren Text laufe die Schrift breiter und sei der Gesamteindruck etwas anders." As a consequence "könne man vielleicht von zwei Schreibern aus derselben Schule sprechen."[40] Unfortunately, however, the original plates have here misled. For, as the plates published later clearly show, the β in 11:33 is part of a correction,[41] and it is readily understandable that the writing of a correction might differ somewhat from that of the original text.[42] Indeed, the difference is made evident by comparison of the εμβριμωμενος of the correction at 11:33 with the εμβριμωμενος of 11:38 on the next page (page 80, line 2), whose β appears more like those on page 1. The slightly larger writing is apparent in the later portion of the codex, but this could be due to the scribe's concern at the beginning of his task that he might use too many folios. (Perhaps he had a fixed allotment, and as he saw the end of his copying in sight, he was able to write larger.) In any case, the possibility of two scribes seems not to have been adopted following the publication of the plates of the entire manuscript.

Some useful distinctions may be made among the corrections in P^{66}. More than half (282, it appears) of the corrected readings are singular, and most of these would seem to be "obvious" scribal mistakes.[43] Quite a few of the remaining original readings are probably also obvious errors which pick up accidental support from other scribes' making the same errors. It happens that at least some of these evident errors can be seen to have been corrected by the scribe immediately after committing an error.[44] The first such case is 1:15a,[45] where John wrote: και κεκραγεν. The scribe of P^{66} first omitted κε- by haplography after the similar-sounding και,[46] and so continued with κρα. But at this point[47] the scribe caught his mistake, and then tried to correct himself in the easiest manner. So he erased (imperfectly) the ρ, and changed the α into an ε. Then he continued with ϰραγεν. Unless we assume--with no justification--that the scribe first wrote ϰαι ϰραϰραγεν, the correction must have been made in the middle of writing a word, and thus made by the scribe himself. A number of other such cases may be found cited by Rhodes.[48]

Indeed, I believe that in two cases the scribe can be seen to have caught himself in the middle of writing a letter. At 10:38b the scribe appears to have begun to write εν εμοι for εν τω πατρι, as the result of a backward leap from εν to εν.[49] However, after completing the ε and the left portion of μ within εμοι, he stopped, erased this ε and left half of μ, and then continued with εν τω $\overline{\pi\rho\iota}$, as his Vorlage clearly contained. The remains of ϵλ are still visible, and it is clear that the scribe had not written ϵμ. The second example is 12:23.[50] Here the scribe began to write εληλθεν, probably under the influence of the common ηλθεν.[51] He caught his error after having written the left portion of ϑ (without the crossbar), erased this fragment of a letter, and then continued with υϑεν. Still visible are the remains of the (.

Other obvious slips have been corrected later, but of course it is not clear whether the scribe made the corrections shortly after committing the error, or whether he (or someone else) made the corrections during a subsequent review of the completed manuscript.[52] However, it is certain that at some point corrections were made to a second Vorlage, since at a number of readings both the original reading and the corrected reading have significant textual support, support which in fact frequently divides rather nicely along known textual traditions.[53] The most thorough examination along these lines is that of Fee, who analyzes 112 corrections in P^{66} where textual relationships may be discerned.[54] Fee's analysis indicates that these corrections are not to be categorized simply as "Neutral," "Western," or "Byzantine,"[55] and so the scribe corrected either to a "mixed" Vorlage or to more than one Vorlagen.[56] In either case, the scribe would have had the opportunity to made further corrections of his earlier slips.

Fee also lists 7 readings where "P^{66c} reads alone against the rest."[57] However, as Fee notes, 1241 supports P^{66c} at one of these, 14:14. On the other hand, my list of corrections in fact gives 15 readings where P^{66c} is singular: 3:33, 4:39a, 5:2b, 5:43b, 8:25b, 12:12, 12:22, 13:24b, 13:35, 14:26, 15:18, 17:5, 17:16, 18:16, and 19:13b.[58] Three of these are orthographic singulars: 4:39a, 12:12, and 18:16. And at 17:5 we have what appears to be the result of an attempt to alter the original Western reading into the reading found in the other manuscripts. The scribe thus added παρα σοι after ειναι, but neglected to delete παρα σοι after ειχον. The result is thus a conflate reading.[59]

Orthography.--Our analysis of the singulars of P[66] begins after the removal of variations due to confusion of ει/ι, αι/ε, and οι/υ. But it may be useful to note that P[66] has been observed to have a very high frequency of such confusions. Martin says: "Les exemples de ces confusions [αι/ε, ει/ι] surabondent, on en trouve à chaque page."[60] And Colwell counted about 400 in the entire papyrus, finding that P[66] has by far the greatest tendency toward this type of scribal error among the three papyri he studied.[61] Fee devoted his Appendix D to the orthographic confusions in P[66], and one will find there the lists of readings of P[66] with ι for ει, ει for ι, η for ει,[62] αι for ε, and ε for αι.[63]

Of our 129 singulars 14 more readings (10.9%) arise from other kinds of orthographic variation. These 14 are classified as follows.

Elision: 1:8 (αλλα for αλλ).[64]

Omission of final -ς before a consonant: 2:11.[65]

Omission of medial σ before μ: 9:16b.[66]

Omission of ρ before a stop: 4:39.[67]

Confusion of -λ- and -λλ-: 12:12.[68]

Addition of final ν to η after εαν:[69] 3:27, 6:65, 9:31.

Addition of final ν to η otherwise:[70] 17:26.

ο for α:[71] 4:31.

ο for ω:[72] 7:3b.

ου for ω in θυρωρος:[73] 18:16b, 18:17.

Crasis: 13:19b. Birdsall suggests that the scribe "may have intended a mannered *crasis* ἐγῷμι."[74] It is also quite possible, as Birdsall says, that this is merely a slip--the omission of one syllable. Indeed, both Fee and Rhodes take it to be a simple slip.[75]

Finally, it is remarkable that many of the corrections involve minor orthographic shifts, indicating that the scribe was concerned about proper spelling, even though the mass of itacistic spellings show that his spelling was quite erratic.[76]

Nonsense Readings.--We turn next to the nonsense readings in P^{66}, upon which Colwell laid great stress in his attempt to understand the nature of the scribe's copying. Our count gives only 8 such readings, but of course the number would be much higher if one were to include the nonsense readings of the text prior to correction. Indeed, in his article on "Scribal Habits" Colwell did precisely that, and so found that "40 per cent" of the singular readings of P^{66} were nonsense.[77] This figure was obtained by his counting--after removing the 400 itacisms--482 singulars in P^{66}, of which 289 remained after the removal of the nonsense readings.[78] Thus, he counted 193 nonsense readings, which are in fact 40% of the 482 (non-itacistic) singulars.

We will return in the next section to the question of whether Colwell's method of considering the readings before correction gives an accurate picture of the scribal characteristics of P^{66}. However, even restricting ourselves to the readings of P^{66} after correction, we find a discrepancy with figures cited elsewhere by Colwell, where he claims that there are 19 "uncorrected Nonsense Readings" in P^{66}.[79] How does he arrive at a total so different from ours?

Let us examine Colwell's "nonsense readings" seriatim. The first two are cited by him as uncorrected among the first 25 nonsense readings in P^{66}.[80]

2:11 ειϛ σαυτον. But this has in fact been corrected.[81]

3:6 γεγεγεννημενον. This is a nonsense singular.

4:23 προσκυνουταϛ. This is supported by W^{supp}, and would in any case be orthographic.[82]

4:31 μετοξυ. This is an orthographic singular.

4:36 θεριζων. This is a nonsense singular.

4:39 ματυρουσηϛ. This is an orthographic singular.

6:52 σαρκαν. This is simply a different form.

6:53 σαρκαν. This is simply a different form.

8:20 ρητα. This is a nonsense singular.

8:26 εχων. This seems not to be nonsense, since one can construe εχων as qualifying λαλω.

8:28 εδειδαξεν μει. This has been corrected.[83]

9:16b σχιμα. This is an orthographic singular.

9:40 υμεις. This is a nonsense singular.

11:22 αιτησης. This is supported by P^{45} W pc, and seems not to be nonsense anyway.[84]

11:35 εδρακυσεν. This is a nonsense singular.

11:38 εν εαυαυτω.[85] This is a nonsense singular.

13:5 ποδονιπτηρα. There appears to be no justification for classifying this reading as nonsense. Ποδονιπτηρ is attested, being a later form of ποδανιπτηρ,[86] and the meaning is quite appropriate in the context.[87]

18:16a γνωτος. Although this word does not occur in the New Testament, it appears to be sensical, and could either be an "older and more correct form of γνωστός,"[88] or have the meaning kinsman, brother.[89]

18:34 αλλοι ειπεν σοι.[90] This is a nonsense singular.

So we count only 7 of Colwell's 19 readings as nonsense singulars. On the other hand, we also include 13:19a, which has been corrected by a later hand.

We have then that 8 (6.2%) of the singulars are nonsense. Three of these are strictly nonsense (3:6, 11:35, 11:38), while the other 5 are nonsense in context (4:36, 8:20 [which could be the plural of ρητον], 9:40, 13:19a, 18:34).

The scribe of P^{66} thus makes some slips, but they are comparatively few, and comparatively minor. A syllable is reduplicated at the end of a line at two places (3:6 and 11:38),[91] and a syllable is once dropped (8:20).[92] These errors involving syllables and the considerable number of such errors which have been corrected confirm Colwell's finding that the scribe "copies syllables, usually two letters in length."[93]

Once a single letter is dropped (4:36), and once (11:35) there is a transposition of three letters. Twice there is confusion of similar words: ημεις and υμεις (9:40),[94] and ειπον and ειπεν (18:34). The remaining nonsense reading, 13:19a, is a more serious omission, and, since there is no evident cause of the omission,[95] it may be the case that the scribe has here omitted one line of his Vorlage.

Accuracy of Copying.--Colwell came to the conclusion that the scribe of P^{66} was extraordinarily careless, based on his examination of the nearly 200 nonsense readings made by the scribe before correction.[96] Indeed, Colwell even claims that "it is hard to believe" that it "was the intention of P^{66}" to "produce a good copy."[97] Colwell continues:

> The nearly 200 nonsense readings and the 400 itacistic spellings in P^{66} are evidence of something less than disciplined attention to the basic task. To this evidence of carelessness must be added those singular readings whose origin baffles speculation, readings that can be given no more exact label than carelessness leading to assorted variant readings. A hurried count shows P^{45} with 20, P^{75} with 57, and P^{66} with 216 purely careless readings.[98]

Thus, Colwell finds the scribe of P^{66} to be "careless and ineffective."[99] "Wildness in copying is the outstanding characteristic of P^{66}."[100] And finally, "P^{66} editorializes as he does everything else--in a sloppy fashion."[101]

These indictments are cited approvingly by Fee,[102] who also concludes: "Just as the scribe is careless in his original copying, even so he corrects without apparent controls."[103]

One positive characteristic is found by Colwell in the scribe's writing: "he is the only calligrapher of the three [P^{45}, P^{66}, P^{75}]. He uses up his care, his concern, in the production of beautiful letters."[104] In fact, Martin had earlier made a similar comment:

> Le copiste, comme on l'a déjà dit, est un praticien exercé qui trace soigneusement les lettres, sans toutefois viser à une régularité absolue mais sans jamais non plus incliner vers la cursive. Toutefois, s'il est bon calligraphe, il n'est pas très attentif à copier son modèle et se rend coupable de très fréquentes omissions, lettres, syllabes, mots isolés, groupes de mots.[105]

On the other hand, there are certain features of P^{66}'s copying which lead to rather different views. Colwell in fact, after doubting that P^{66} had the intention to "produce a good copy," reverses himself four pages later with the claim that P^{66} had "the intention of making a good copy." The full passage is:

> P^{66} seems to reflect a scribe working with the intention of making a good copy, falling into careless errors, particularly the error of dropping a letter, a syllable, a word, or even a phrase where it is doubled, but also under the control of some other person, or second standard, so that the corrections which are made are usually corrections to a reading read by a number of other witnesses. Nine out of ten of the nonsense readings are corrected, and two out of three of all his singular readings. In short, P^{66} gives the impression of being the product of a scriptorium, i.e, a publishing house. It shows the supervision of a foreman, or of a scribe turned proofreader.[106]

Apart from the contradiction with the earlier claim (did the scribe intend to produce a good copy or not?), there are several points in this statement which need clarification. For one thing, the "control" of which Colwell speaks is clearly the control of the scribe himself. There is no clear evidence of any correction by a "foreman," and the corrections to a second standard were all, with at most a few exceptions, by the scribe. Of course, it is conceivable that the scribe felt pressure from someone else to copy correctly. But this is a pressure which any scribe could feel. The fact is that the scribe makes his own corrections, whether of scribal slips or to a second Vorlage, and rather often makes them in the course of his copying. It is thus clear that, as Colwell here puts the matter, the scribe

UMI

himself did indeed intend to produce a good copy.

Furthermore, the comparatively low percentage of nonsense readings and the not excessive frequency of singulars generally in the corrected copy show that the scribe of P^{66} was able to carry out his intention. Aland, in fact, says that the scribe performed his corrections "mit offensichtlicher Sorgfalt,"[107] and such a description does seem to be truer to the final result than is Colwell's imputation of sloppiness.

What we have, then, is that our scribe was not sloppy _simpliciter_. Sloppiness would be an apt description of part of the scribe's activity: the initial act of copying. But this is only the first part of the scribe's work. (In contrast, the initial act of copying is virtually the whole activity of the scribe of P^{45}.) The second part is characterized by reasonable care: the correction of obvious slips either while copying or during a later check, and the comparison with and correction to one or more additional _Vorlagen_. It is unfair to isolate one portion of this activity, and to judge the scribe on the basis of that portion.[108] The total activity is indeed rather careful, and this care is shown clearly by the fact that the papyrus, when it left the scribe's hands, contained a fairly low percentage of nonsense readings.[109]

The nature of the initial part of the scribe's activity has led to a conjecture which can, I believe, be seen not to fit the facts. Aland concluded from the character of the writing that the papyrus comes "von der Hand eines Berufsschreibers."[110] Nevertheless, Aland criticized Martin's suggestion that the codex was the product of the scriptorium attached to a monastery,[111] on the grounds that there is no evidence for the existence of monasteries in the year 200, or for the existence of scriptoria at all connected with the Church at that early date.

Thus, Aland considers the possibility that "ein christlicher Berufsschreiber für sich in privater Arbeit das Johannesevangelium abgeschrieben hätte."[112] But this possibility is rejected:

> spricht gegen einen Christen als Schreiber des P^{66} die ausserordentlich grosse Zahl von Auslassungen und Schreibversehen . . . .[113]

Aland's own suggestion is, accordingly, that a non-Christian scriptorium was commissioned to make the copy:

> Das [the evidence of errors and corrections] spricht für eine mehr mechanische Schreibarbeit, d.h. für einen christlichen (bzw. gnostischen) „Lohnauftrag" an eine Schreibwerkstatt.[114]

Again, though, the care which characterizes the scribe's overall activity speaks against his work being simply a "mechanische Schreibarbeit." Indeed, Heinrich Greeven has cited this care as being strong evidence that the scribe of P^{66} is not simply interested in earning a fee for copying. Greeven comments:

> Es liegt auf der Hand, wie wichtig es ist, zu erkennen, ob ein Schreiber sorgsam oder achtlos gearbeitet hat. So finden sich z.B. im Papyrus Bodmer des Johannesevangeliums (P^{66}) auffallend viele Schreibversehen. Aber--was noch wichtiger ist--der Schreiber selbst hat sie verbessert. V. Martin hat in seiner Ausgabe darauf hingewiesen, dass eine grosse Zahl von Korrekturen in diesem Papyrus noch während des Schreibens von der ersten Hand ausgeführt sind. Das ist ein verhältnismässig selten anzutreffender Befund. Und ich denke, es ist nicht schwer zu verstehen, warum er so selten ist. Der Schreiber erwartete in der Regel entweder den klingenden Lohn oder doch wenigstens das Lob seines Auftraggebers. Beides war aber in Frage gestellt, wenn er eine Arbeit ablieferte, die auf den ersten Blick von Verbesserungen über und unter der Zeile, von Rasuren und Auswaschungen, Tilgungs- und Versetzungsmarken, von Zeichen und Textstücken auf den Rändern strotzte. Auch ein gewissenhafter Abschreiber wird aus diesem Grunde gezögert haben, eine Korrektur z.B. dann anzubringen, wenn er lediglich die Wortfolge etwas verändert hatte, ohne dass Sinngehalt und Stil einen Schaden erlitten. . . . Der Schreiber von P^{66} freilich ist von solchen Rücksichten nicht geplagt; er verbessert, wie wir sahen, eifrig. Er erweist sich damit zugleich als flüchtiger wie als gewissenhafter Abschreiber.[115]

Greeven's perceptive remarks would suggest that he considers the scribe of P^{66} to be a Christian, who is committed to delivering a copy which literally reproduces the words of his Vorlage. But in fact Greeven does not draw this conclusion, and does not mention Aland's earlier hypothesis.

However, apart from this general care which the scribe exercises, there are several other indications which make it certain that the scribe was a Christian. In the first place, several of his errors indicate a familiarity with the writings of the New Testament: 6:69, which appears to have been harmonized to Jn 11:27 and Mt 16:16; and 13:1a, which has been harmonized to Jn 2:4. Most of the harmonizations are to the immediate context, but there are enough which are to remote parallels or to general New Testament usage to make it clear that the scribe of P^{66} knew at least some of the writings of the New Testament well enough that he could introduce their phrases into his text.[116]

Furthermore, the scribe uses, without complete consistency,[117] several of the usual abbreviations for *nomina sacra*. And it can be demonstrated that the scribe is not simply reproducing these from his *Vorlage*. For at 3:8a and 6:63a he started to write πνευμα *plene*, caught himself after writing πνευ, and then erased ευ and added α and the line; the result in each case is $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$.[118] Even stronger evidence that the scribe himself is familiar with these abbreviations is provided by an error at 4:11b. Here the scribe wrote βαϑυ and then (carelessly) added the line above ϑυ, so as to produce the abbreviation for ϑεου.[119] The scribe was probably responsible for the subsequent erasure (imperfectly accomplished) of this line, but its initial presence is significant.

Finally, we may refer to the presence in P^{66} of the rather unusual abbreviations of σταυρος and σταυροω by means of the symbol σ̅⳨̅. These forms begin with Jn 19:6,[120] and thus were not known to Aland when he discussed the identity of the scribe of P^{66}. But Aland later devoted an article to the subject of these abbreviations,[121] and his remarks there strongly support the view that the scribe was in fact a Christian. (Aland does not discuss this subject himself.) For, although Aland claims that P^{66} could not have been the first to use these forms,[122] it is true that P^{66} and P^{75} are the earliest sources for the forms. It would appear rather unlikely that a non-Christian scribe would be responsible for such an early use of these abbreviations, especially in the light of Aland's position that

> das Christogramm ursprünglich ein „Staurogramm" gewesen ist. Mit ihm bezeichnete man das Zentrum des christlichen Glaubens, das Kreuz, genauer gesagt: den Tod Christi am Kreuz.[123]

Summing up, then, we see that the scribe of P^{66} is a scribe who exercises great care to render a literal copy of his Vorlage (or, rather, his Vorlagen). He uses abbreviations for nomina sacra, and is so used to them that he can even introduce one where it is not intended. He also uses a somewhat rare abbreviation which is first attested about the year 200 and which has Christological significance. And the scribe's errors reflect his knowledge of various passages in the Gospel of John and other New Testament works, and indeed of New Testament terminology generally. Who but a

Christian could possibly be such a scribe in A.D. 200?

Fee presupposes that the scribe is a Christian in his remark:

> The fact that he [the scribe of P^{66}] has copied the Gospel of John at all probably indicates that it was "sacred," but that he copied and corrected in the fashion that he does probably indicates further that it was not "canonical Scripture."[124]

Fee means, of course, that the scribe held the opinion that the Gospel of John was sacred but not canonical Scripture. But I believe that it should at least be left open whether the scribe would have viewed the Gospel as canonical. We necessarily have no firm evidence to show us how a scribe who made such a distinction between "sacred" and "canonical" in the time around 200 would have proceeded. However, what we can see is that the scribe of P^{66} has high standards and attempts to meet them in the course of his copying. He does fail, of course, to produce a perfect copy, even after his extensive correcting. But this failure--common to all scribes--seems not to be due to his viewing the Gospel of John as unworthy of perfect reproduction. On the contrary, the scribe tries, fails to reach perfection in spite of his attempt, but nevertheless achieves a respectable level of accuracy after his corrections are completed.[125]

We turn now to the analysis of the 107 significant singulars.[126]

Additions.--There are 14 singulars (13.1% of the significant singulars) which are additions. The words added may be classified as follows:

a) Conjunctions (4 cases): 1:17 (δε),[127] 16:33 (δε), 18:31 (ουν), and 18:38a (ουν).

b) Pronouns (4 cases): 3:33 (ουτος), 14:26 (υμιν), 15:6 (αυτα), and 17:6 (τουτου).

c) Proper noun (1 case): 6:61 (ιησους).[128]

d) Verb (1 case): 11:27 (πιστευω).

e) Article (1 case): 15:13 (την).[129]

f) Conjunction and verb (1 case): 18:37 (και ειπεν).

g) Verb and pronoun (1 case): 8:25b (ειπον υμιν).

h) Preposition and pronoun (1 case): 17:5 (παρα σοι).

The reasons for these additions are straightforward. The four added conjunctions all relieve asyndeta. Moreover, the additions of ουν as well as 17:6 and 18:37 are harmonizations to general usage. The addition at 17:5 is, as noted earlier, a conflate reading resulting from a partially effected correction.[130] The remaining seven additions are harmonizations to the immediate context.

Eleven of these additions are of only one word, and the other three are of two words. So the 14 additions increase the text by 17 words, for an average of 1.2 words per addition.

Omissions.--The scribe of P^{66} omitted many phrases, words, and parts of words which were subsequently restored by corrections.[131] There remain 19 of the singulars (17.8% of the significant singulars) which are omissions. All but 4 of these are of one word only, and these 15 can be classified as follows:

a) Article (4 cases):[132] 5:36 (before πατηρ),[133] 6:70 (before ιησους),[134] 9:28b (before μωυσεως),[135] and 11:25 (before ιησους).

b) Preposition (3 cases): 1:4 (εν, leap after γεγονεν),[136] 9:30 (εν), and 11:54b (εις).

c) Pronoun (3 cases): 5:43 (με, leap after λαμβανετε), 8:42a (εγω),[137] and 17:11 (αυτοι or ουτοι, leap after και).

d) Noun (2 cases): 9:16a (ανθρωπος), and 11:39 (κυριε).

e) Conjunction (2 cases): 14:19 (δε),[138] and 19:6 (και).

f) Verb (1 case): 17:9 (ερωτω).

These omissions would seem to be due to carelessness, or, as we have seen in other papyri, to a desire to avoid unnecessary words, thus creating a more elegant Greek.[139] In particular, the omissions at 11:54b and 17:9 remove one of two occurrences of the word in question within a brief space.

The four longer omissions are: 11:4 (where the omission of του θεου, if not just careless, may be to produce the unmodified ο υιος found elsewhere in John[140]); 17:16 (a leap of 12 words [πονηρου ... κοσμου] made as a correction);[141] 17:18 (a leap of 6 words [based on the repetition of -ς εις τον κοσμον κα-]); and 19:38 (an unexplained omission of 4 words).[142] These last three errors demonstrate clearly that the scribe's attention to his task lessened as he approached the end of his copying.

These 19 omissions cause the loss of 39 words, for an average of 2.1 words per omission. So the omissions tend, thanks to 17:16 and 17:18, to be rather longer than the additions. The overall effect of these additions and omissions is to create the loss of 22 words, for an average loss of only .2 word per significant singular. This is a very low rate, and indeed the scribe's additions and omissions would have precisely balanced if he had not made the errors at 17:16 and 17:18.

Transpositions.--Eighteen of the singulars (16.8% of the significant singulars) involve a transposition, and the text transposed tends to be rather brief:

2 words (11 cases): 5:6, 7:27, 10:31, 11:17,[143] 11:31, 13:33,[144] 13:34, 13:35b, 15:19c, 17:24, 18:30.

2 or 3 words (1 case): 18:38c.

3 words (4 cases): 4:14, 13:1b, 18:36, 19:2.

4 words (2 cases): 15:19b, 19:13.[145]

Three of these may be the result of an initial scribal leap followed by a "correction" out of order:

13:1b: του κοσμου τουτου

18:36: του κοσμου τουτου

18:38c: ουδεμιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν or
ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω.[146]

In two cases of transposition Fee claims that the shift is to what may be a more "logical" order: 11:17 and 18:38c.[147]

P^{66} is second only to P^{45} (21.2%) in its percentage of transpositions. Fee has emphasized the frequency of this type of error in P^{66}:

> The single most frequent cause of variation in P^{66} from its basic tradition is the transposition of words. There are at least 79 such occurrences in the MS, 23 of which are singular to P^{66}. Although there are seven such singular readings which have been corrected, the large number of these readings, both singular and otherwise, seems to indicate that the scribe tended to show a general lack of concern for the order of words.[148]

Again, however, a qualification is necessary. Colwell points out that, on occasion at least, the scribe of P^{66} is willing to disfigure his text in order to produce the correct order:

> P^{66} gives the impression of working in a controlled situation. If he catches a transposition while he is writing, he erases the out-of-order word and writes the correct-order-word over it. If the transposition is caught later, strokes between lines correct it. This never happens in P^{45}. He feels free to make the order of words what he wants to make it, and he is a careful workman.[149]

Thus, by his corrections the scribe does demonstrate concern for the correct word order. In fact, there are 11 corrections in P^{66} involving word order only, and 3 more which involve word order and another change.[150] If we were to evaluate P^{66}'s tendencies before correction, we would have 8 additional singular transpositions: 4:9d, 5:5, 9:10a, 9:30, 10:4, 13:20c, 14:2a, and 15:16a.[151]

Consequently, the high percentage of transpositions in P^{66} should not be taken as an indication that the scribe is unconcerned about word order. He is concerned, but is not able to exercise enough care to catch all the transpositions which he tends to make. P^{45}, on the other hand, shows comparatively little concern about word order, and never bothers to correct his frequent transpostions. Colwell makes this contrast clearly:

> P^{45} gladly is free of any obligation to reproduce words faithfully, but P^{66} has accepted that obligation and regrets his failures to live up to it.[152]

Furthermore, P^{66} does not have the transpositions of longer blocks of text which we find in P^{45}. The scribe of P^{66} copies by syllables, and thus stays closer to the given word order. The scribe of P^{45}, in contrast, tends to deal with the content of the words, and thus is freer to rearrange quite a few words at a time.

Harmonizations.--Four of the singulars of P^{66} may have arisen by harmonization to remote parallels:[153]

6:69: The reading here may be influenced by Jn 11:27 and Mt 16:16.[154]

10:16: The substitution of συναγαγειν may have come about because of the συναγομενος συναχθησεται of the parallel in Mic 2:12 LXX, or was perhaps occasioned by συναγαγη in the similar passage at Jn 11:52.[155]

13:1a: The reading here is likely assimilated to the ουπω ηκει η ωρα μου of Jn 2:4.[156]

18:38c: If the transposition here is not merely a corrected leap, then it is probably a harmonization to Lk 23:4.[157]

We again find that most of the harmonizations are to the immediate context; as many as 23 such cases occur in the papyrus: 1:21 (τις in vs. 19 and vs. 22), 1:50 (as in vs. 48[158]), 3:33 (τουτο in vs. 32), 6:61 (ιησους in vs. 61a[159]), 7:8 and 7:30 (ουδεπω in vs. 39 [P^{66} P^{75} ς pm]),[160] 8:25b (ειπον υμιν in vs. 24),[161] 8:42b (εληλυθα in vs. 42b), 8:42c (perfect εληλυθα in vs. 42), 9:37 (αυτον in vs. 37a), 10:3 (preceding ιδια[162]), 11:27 (πιστευω twice in vs. 26 and once in vs. 27b[163]), 11:33 (preposition taken from the verbal prefix),[164] 12:2a (ηλθεν and ηγειρεν in vs. 1), 14:26 (υμιν twice in vs. 25, υμιν in vs. 26b, υμας twice in vs. 26b), 15:4 (ο μενων εν εμοι in vs. 5),[165] 15:6 (αυτα [ς A B θ pm, αυτο ℵ D pm] earlier in vs. 6), 15:8 (πλειονα in vs. 2),[166] 15:13 (article-noun-article-pronoun in vs. 11 and vs. 12), 15:15 (λεγω in vs. 15a), 15:18 (imperfect εφιλει in vs. 19), 15:19c (order of vs. 18), 15:24 (μη in vs. 24a).

Nine readings appear to be harmonizations to general usage:

10:34 and 18:37: The scribe writes the common idiom:[167] απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν.

13:35a: The common construction of μαθηται with the genitive (αυτου, etc.) has influenced the shift from εμοι to εμου.

17:3: The scribe has written a form of πεμπω,[168] which is used somewhat more often than αποστελλω in John for the sending of Jesus.[169]

17:6: The scribe writes "this world," which is a common Johannine phrase (8:23, etc.).

17:24: Fee notes that the order in P^{66} conforms to the usual order (nominative pronoun before verb) found in John.[170]

18:31 and 18:38a: The addition of ουν conforms to the very frequent use of ουν in John.[171]

21:6b: The scribe has here substituted ονοματι in order to produce "your name" instead of "your word."[172]

The overall pattern of harmonizations thus is:

		107 sign. singulars	36 harmonizations
23	to context	21.5%	63.9%
9	to general usage	8.4%	25.0%
4	to parallels	3.7%	11.1%
36	harmonizations	33.6%	

So we again find that the pattern confirms Colwell's view that harmonization to the immediate context is the most likely sort of harmonization.

It is also again true that only the additions arise to a considerable extent by harmonization. In fact, of the 14 additions, 7 (50.0%) are harmonizations to the context and 4 others (28.6%) are harmonizations to general usage. The other 3 consist of 17:5 and 2 additions of δε.

The sorts of errors produced by the various types of harmonization are as follows:

		Replacement	Addition	Transposition
23	to context	15(65.2%)	7(30.4%)	1(4.3%)
9	to general usage	4(44.4%)	4(44.4%)	1(11.1%)
4	to parallels[173]	3(75.0%)	0	1(25.0%)
36	harmonizations	22(61.1%)	11(30.6%)	3(8.3%)

Grammatical Changes.--Fifteen of the singulars arise from the interchange of similar forms. At 11:20 we have εαυτης for αυτης, a common fluctuation.[174] The scribe writes σαρκαν at 6:52 and 6:53, as does P^{46} at Eph 5:31.[175] And at 8:28 P^{66} is alone in having ουδε εν for ουδεν.[176]

At 20:18 P^{66} has the Attic form εορακα.[177] And the remaining ten readings in this category involve confusions of different conjugations. At 5:30 the scribe writes δυνομαι, the later form.[178] And there are nine errors regarding second aorist forms: 7:3a, 7:35, 7:45, 9:10, 9:35, 12:13, 13:2a, 18:25, and 19:32.[179]

Fee presents a useful analysis of "variations in verb form" in P^{66}, concluding that "at most places where it deviates from its basic textual tradition, it does so in favor of an easier or smoother text."[180] Most of the singular readings involving such variation are shifts of tense:

Aorist to perfect:[181] 8:42b and 8:42c (both harmonizations to the context).

Perfect to present: 15:15 (harmonization to context).

Imperfect to aorist: 12:11 (with an omission).

Present to aorist: 13:24.

Present to imperfect: 15:18 (harmonization to context).

Present to future: 9:4.

Future to present: 8:36 and 15:21.[182]

And there is also the shift from the indicative to the participle at 8:26.

If our reading at 21:2 is correct, the scribe took Thomas to be ο λεγομενος διδυμου, that is, as said to be the son of Didymus. This appears to be the only place where P66 confuses the case of a noun, and is a mere blunder.

Three readings conflict with established aspects of Johannine style, as discussed by Fee. John usually writes εγω ειμι, except that he writes οπου ειμι εγω the five times that phrase occurs. However, at 17:24 P66 writes οπου εγω ειμι, thus conforming to John's general usage elsewhere. P66 also transposes at 12:26, but there finds support from D W pc.[183] Likewise, at 1:50 and 11:31 P66's reading eliminates instances of the Johannine fondness for "variation."[184]

Fee further observes that the "second major cause of variation in P66 from the Neutral tradition is the addition/omission/alteration of conjunctions."[185] It is, of course, commonly noted that the author of John had a tendency to permit asyndeton,[186] and it is natural to imagine that scribes attempted to eliminate such harshness in favor of a smoother text. P^{66}, in any case, demonstrates such movement toward smoothness, and Fee cites 35 cases where P^{66} has a conjunction at a point where the Neutral text has asyndeton.[187] Four of these are singular readings:[188] 1:17, 16:33, 18:31, and 18:38a. Since the tendency toward smoothness is a tendency which many scribes likely exemplified, and since the choice of possible conjunctions is fairly limited, one can well suppose that P^{66} has also introduced conjunctions at many other places but has been joined (coincidentally) by other scribes.

On the other hand, there are two singular omissions of conjunctions: 14:19 and 19:6.[189] Both omissions create asyndeton, and thus both are likely to be simple slips.

Finally, there are four interchanges of conjunctions:

7:28 δε for ουν
8:25a και for ουν
12:22 δε for τε[190]
15:12 ως for καθως

It is interesting that, at the first two places,[191] P^{66} replaces the word which is elsewhere introduced (18:31 and 18:38a) to relieve asyndeton, and which is characteristic of Johannine style.[192]

Fee also discusses the readings in P^{66} which involve the addition or omission of the article before proper nouns.[193] Fee fails to find any clear tendency in P^{66} with respect to this grammatical point, and ends his discussion with a conclusion and an inference:

> The conclusion: Although P^{66} does add/omit the article sometimes at variance with the Neutral MSS, for the most part it adheres quite closely--almost rigidly--to its basic textual tradition. The inference: Since this is one of the few points of style where P^{66} fails to pick up a pattern of secondary readings (in the sense that it fails to read the much more common Greek idiom of using the article before the proper noun), its witness may be very important for the discovery of Johannine style at this point.[194]

Of course, this entire issue of the use of the article before proper nouns is complex,[195] but P^{66} does show a tendency in its singular readings. For there the scribe omits the article before proper nouns three times (6:70, 9:28b, 11:25),[196] while he never adds an article before a proper noun. And in general the scribe omits four articles and adds only one.[197] These data suggest that the scribe of P^{66} does tend to omit the article before proper nouns.

Finally, we may note here the one case of a singular reading involving a prepositional prefix, 10:16, which seems to have arisen by harmonization to parallels.

Proper Names.--Two of the singulars involve the spelling of proper names: 5:2 and 13:2b. In the latter case we simply have a geminated ν, which is a common orthographic variation.[198] At 5:2 we have a variation involving βηθσαιδα and the several alternative spellings of this name and of βηθεσδα. P^{66} has βηθ- at Jn 1:44, but shifts to βηδ- here at 5:2 and later at 12:21. In general, the manuscripts show a good deal of fluctuation in their spellings, and βηδσαιδα(ν) is found as follows:

Mt 11:21	ℵ$^{*\text{et c}}$ Π* 489
Mk 6:45	A 579
Mk 8:22	none
Lk 9:10	P^{75} ℵ$^{\text{ca}}$ D N 213
Lk 10:13	P^{75} A B* (D βεδ-)
Jn 1:44	P^{75*} Θ
Jn 5:2	P^{66}
Jn 12:21	P^{66} D K W 0250 pc

It is possible, of course, that the confusion is simply orthographic,[199] although both P^{66} and P^{75} exhibit peculiar patterns in their spellings. P^{66} begins with βηθ-, and then changes to βηδ- for the final two occurrences. P^{75} has βηδ- in Luke, starts to continue this spelling in John, but corrects himself (at 1:44), and writes βηθ- there and subsequently in John.[200]

Summary.--The following are the chief characteristics of the copying activity of the scribe of P^{66}.

I. The manuscript is marred by a very high density of corrections, mostly of obvious slips, but sometimes to a different exemplar. Virtually all the corrections are by the scribe, and indicate that he had the goal of producing an accurate copy. The text after his corrections were made contains rather few nonsense readings and few orthographic singulars, although the scribe commonly has various itacistic spellings.

II. The scribe has a very slight tendency to omit more often than he adds, but his additions and omissions are usually rather short.

III. The scribe tends to transpose fairly often, despite his efforts to correct transpositions.

IV. Harmonization is frequent, and is most often to the immediate context.

V. The scribe attempts to smooth out certain harsh readings, and in particular tends to eliminate asyndeta.

FOOTNOTES

[1] This is the date assigned by the editor; see Victor Martin, ed., Papyrus Bodmer II (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956), p. 17: "au début du III^{e} siècle ou si l'on préfère à environ l'an 200 de notre ère." This dating is followed by later scholars (see Aland, Repertorium, p. 296), except that Herbert Hunger has assigned P^{66} to the second century; cf. his "Zur Datierung des Papyrus Bodmer II (P66)," Anzeiger der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1960, Nr. 4, pp. 12-33.

[2] The original contents occupied, as it seems, 156 pages (78 folios); see Victor Martin, ed., Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958), p. 5.

[3] Aland's list of the contents (Repertorium, pp. 296-97) cites the page numbers as "fol," and also numbers only the extant pages, thus citing p. 34 as "fol 34" and p. 39 (after the lacuna) as "fol 35." I follow the pagination of the codex and the edition.

[4] Actually, the legible text breaks off at 21:9 on p. 152. Only a few remnants are preserved of pp. 153-54.

[5] These are published on pp. 151-52 of the photographs in Victor Martin and J. W. B. Barns, eds., Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément, Nouvelle édition augmentée et corrigée (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1962). The identifications are due to Kurt Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri III," New Testament Studies, 20 (1973-74), pp. 376-81 (part 2 on P^{66}). The same results are also reported in his "Über die Möglichkeit der Identifikation kleiner Fragmente neutestamentlicher Handschriften mit Hilfe des Computers," Studies in New Testament Language and Text, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. LXIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 33-37.

[6] Papyrus Bodmer II, p. 7: "Lorsqu'elle [la leçon] est soulignée, il s'agit d'une leçon nouvelle différente de celle ou celles de la tradition."

[7] *Ibid.*: "L'apparat critique représente la collation du papyrus avec le texte de l'édition du Nouveau Testament grec due à Alex. Souter, 2e éd., Oxford, 1947." Among the many criticisms of this procedure may be mentioned that of Kurt Aland, "Papyrus Bodmer II: Ein erster Bericht," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 82 (1957), cols. 165-67.

[8] *Supplément*, p. 6: "Pour tenir compte des objections qu'a rencontrées notre choix de l'édition Souter comme terme de comparaison, nous nous sommes servi pour cette dernière partie du papyrus de la vingt-troisième édition Nestle-Aland (1957), complétée au moyen de l'édition de Tischendorf de 1869."

[9] Note, for example, that P^{66}'s αυτον απολυσαι at 19:12 is underlined as being singular, although Tischendorf cites M 33 Cyr for this reading (and von Soden adds W 1170 1242). Moreover, P^{66}'s omission of ει at 18:17 is claimed to be singular, although in fact only P^{66*} omits, as noted in the revised edition.

[10] *Supplément*, *Nouvelle édition*, p. 7: "L'apparat critique est rédigé conformément aux principes adoptés pour le P. Bodmer XIV-XV, c'est-à-dire qu'il se réduit à une comparaison du texte du papyrus avec celui de la vingt-quatrième édition du N. T. grec de Nestle-Aland (1960) qui est suivi également lorsqu'il s'agit de combler des lacunes." Such an apparatus seems totally worthless for any textual study of the manuscript concerned (except for knowing how often it differs from the twenty-fourth edition of Nestle-Aland).

[11] Gordon D. Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics*, Studies and Documents, Vol. XXXIV (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968), Appendix A, pp. 85-97. Fee utilizes the earlier work by: H. M. Teeple and F. A. Walker, "Notes on the Plates in Papyrus Bodmer II," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 78 (1959), pp. 148-52; M.-E. Boismard, Review of *Papyrus Bodmer II*, *Supplément*, *Nouvelle édition*, ed. by Victor Martin and J. W. B. Barns, *Revue biblique*, 70 (1963), pp. 120-33; Kurt Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," *New Testament Studies*, 10 (1963-64), pp. 62-64; and Fee, "Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and the Nestle Greek Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 84 (1965), pp. 66-72.

[12] There are two readings found in the fragments located by Aland (see note 5 above) which are singular according to the evidence in Tischendorf, but which find support elsewhere: 16:19 and 20:15.

Erroll F. Rhodes, "The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II," *New Testament Studies*, 14 (1967-68), p. 281 n. 2, points out that P^{66} had δυνησεται at 9:4. Martin printed δυναται, which Aland, Boismard, and Fee altered to δυνηται (see Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 92). But the space suggests that something is missing in the right margin (for the surrounding lines, ψαν, ερ, σμ, and αει must be supplied), and δυνησεται seems reasonable. Rhodes, p. 276, also notes that P^{66c} omits με at 5:43.

At 18:16a the editors give γνωστος; however, Colwell ("External Evidence," p. 7) cites γνωτος, which appears to be correct.

And at two readings I have suggested reconstructions which seem not to have been given previously. At 9:16a the space seems insufficient for αιανος, since for the surrounding four lines only υο, ρει, ποι, and ςλε must be supplied. I suggest that only δυναται was present.

And at 21:2 Martin printed [δι]δυμος, revised by Martin and Barns to δ[ι]δ̣υ̣μο̣ς. However, the ο is in fact quite clear in the photograph, only a small upper right section being missing in the triangular shaped hole. Consequently, the following letter survives in the traces which look like: . This can only be an Υ, and thus υ should be printed without a dot. (Note that the υ at 21:2 is much more intact than the one at 20:18 [p. 146, l. 7], where we read --λλου̣σα.)

[13] Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 35. See the evidence presented by Fee in *Papyrus*, Chapter II, pp. 9-35, the comments of Aland, "Papyrus Bodmer II," cols. 176-80, and the table of textual relationships in Jn 11 as established by Colwell and Tune, "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships Between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," *Studies*, p. 60 (using the editio princeps of P^{66}; see p. 61).

[14] Support from W (or W^{supp}) was found at 3:31, 4:23, 9:34, and 13:16. Support from Θ was found at 3:21. (Von Soden's apparatus indicates that Θ has ηργασαμενα, but Beermann and Gregory have ηργασμενα.) On the other hand, at 4:36 Beermann and Gregory print θεριζων without ο, and Fee (*Papyrus*, p. 115) accordingly cites Θ as supporting P^{66}. However, Beermann and Gregory do not especially cite this (then singular) reading in their appendix. Moreover,

Nestle-Aland cites P^{66} for the omission but does not cite Θ, even though Θ should be cited by them if it agrees here. So I assume that Beermann and Gregory's text is incorrect, and thus retain 4:36 as a singular reading.

Also, at 20:18 Nestle-Aland cites 892^{supp} as having εωρακα, but the reading of P^{66} is also said to be εωρακα. It is possible, therefore, that 892^{supp} may agree with P^{66}'s εορακα, although I am unable to determine whether this may be the case. (Harris' collation does not cover 892^{supp}.) Consequently, 20:18 is still considered singular.

[15] Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 58 n. 5. However, two of these are non-singular, since W^{supp} agrees with P^{66} at 4:23, and ℵ agrees with P^{66} at 18:30 (ℵ has παρεδωκειμεν). At 9:4 Fee has δυνηται, whereas our list has δυνησεται (see note 12 above), and Fee's 9:17 (σχιμα) is our 9:16b. So we have 16 singulars here.

Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 281 n. 2, cites 14 readings as "Slips overlooked in antiquity." But he also includes 4:23, and moreover takes P^{66} as omitting ω after κοσμω at 9:5. But the space appears (barely) adequate for κο̣[σμω]/ω; note that the next line must be completed as τ̣αυτ[αει], and the following as ε̣[ποι].

[16] Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 67. These are all singular except for 14:14, where Fee erroneously cites P^{66c} 1241 as reading εγω τουτο. He makes the same error at p. 32, but has the correct reading at p. 26. So there are 6 singulars here.

[17] *Ibid*., pp. 128-38.

[18] *Ibid*., p. 131. Tischendorf cites support for 11:44, and Θ supports 3:21.

[19] Tischendorf cites support for 3 of the examples given by Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 136: 8:57 (Fee has 8:58), 9:37, and 15:24. 3:31 is supported by W^{supp}. So we are left with 7:3b and 20:18. Fee does not mention 13:16 here, although it too is supported by W.

[20] These are 7:3a, 7:35, 7:45, 9:10, 9:35, 12:13, 13:2a, 18:25, and 19:32. The other readings cited by Fee find support in Tischendorf, except for 9:34 (εξεβαλαν = W).

[21] Fee, *Papyrus*, pp. 98-122.

[22] Von Soden notes support for 1:27b (*ibid*., p. 102), 8:51 (*ibid*., p. 120), 8:55 (*ibid*., p. 102), and 9:28a (*ibid*., p. 106). Nestle-Aland (the 26th edition) adds support for 9:29 (*ibid*., p. 106), 12:2b (*ibid*., p. 113), and 18:38b (*ibid*., p. 113). Fee actually cites 98 singular and sub-

UMI

singular readings of P^{66}, including 12:47 twice (on p. 112 and p. 121). Fee cites support for 22 of these.

[23] Some of these are minor matters which Fee evidently just ignored. The 24 readings are: 1:8, 3:6, 3:27, 5:2, 5:43 (see note 12 above), 6:65, 9:16a (see note 12 above), 9:31, 9:40, 11:54b, 12:12, 13:19a (but see Fee, Papyrus, p. 59), 15:18, 17:9, 17:11, 17:18 (the editors [Supplément, p. 23, and Supplément, Nouvelle édition, p. 23] say of these words which were omitted: "fortasse in marg. inf. supplentur"; this is possible, but there is no reason to believe that the correction was in fact made), 17:26, 18:16a (see note 12 above), 18:16b, 18:17, 18:34, 19:6, 19:38, and 21:2 (see note 12 above).

[24] Fee separates 12:11 into two readings (Papyrus, p. 110 and p. 121), and cites two readings as having support which don't: 1:17 (Fee, ibid., p. 16 and p. 103, takes W as supporting P^{66}, but see his own distinction with respect to 7:27 on p. 102) and 11:20 (ibid., p. 120; 2768 [Fee has 053; see Introduction, note 4] does not quite agree with P^{66}). Moreover, at 21:6b P^{66} has a reading which is not found in the continuous-text Greek manuscripts which have the addition there, even though Fee (ibid., p. 122) just cites $\aleph^{ca}$ as having the same addition as P^{66}. Finally, I have counted 4:36 as singular, although Fee doesn't.

There are a few other places where our reading of P^{66} disagrees with Fee's, and these will be noted later in the discussion of specific singulars.

Therefore, our 129 readings consist of 16 "slips" (see note 15), 6 corrections (see note 16), 2 examples of writing ο for ω (see note 19), 9 forms of aorists (see note 20), plus 68 singulars noted by Fee in Appendix B (76 minus the 7 with support [see note 22], and minus one citation of 12:11), plus 24 further singulars (see note 23), plus the 4 mentioned earlier in this note.

By the way, Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 281 n. 2, does cite 3:6, 9:31, and 9:40, among his list of "slips."

[25] Metzger, Text, p. 40, says that there are "about four hundred and forty alterations." Fee, Papyrus, p. 57, claims that there are "approximately 450." Rhodes, who considers only the text of Jn 1:1 - 14:26, says that "there are well over three hundred" corrections ("Corrections," p. 271).

[26] Martin, Papyrus Bodmer II, p. 32, calls attention to the frequency of erasure, and says: "Ce recours au grattoir est assez fréquent, encore qu'on ne puisse pas toujours

distinguer une surface grattée d'une défectuosité locale préexistante du papyrus que le scribe a été obligé d'enjamber." Martin goes on (p. 32 n. 1 and p. 33) to cite six cases of this difficulty. And in two of them I do not count a correction: 4:49 and 7:16 (Martin's 24.18 and 46.7).

However, in two other cases I believe that it is at least possible that a correction has occurred: 4:23a and 5:36d (Martin's 20.19 and 31.16). And at 3:16 (Martin's 14.5) Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 273, finds that the scribe originally wrote ηγαπα, thus harmonizing to John's general usage, then erased the final α, and wrote ησεν after. This scenario does appear to fit the appearance of the codex.

At Martin's final case, 5:9 (Martin's 26.16) I believe that the scribe at first leaped forward a few lines in his Vorlage to the occurrence of και περιεπατει ην δε, and thus wrote και περιπατει ην δε. At this point he caught his error, erased ην δε, and then proceeded with the usual text of vs. 9 after the erasure. Indeed, the photograph indicates a few remaining spots of ink within what I thus take to be the erasure.

Fee, Papyrus, p. 57 n. 2, also discusses the difficulty of obtaining an accurate count of the corrections, and remarks: "At other places one cannot tell whether a blank space is the result of the crossing out of a letter, or simply a rough spot on the papyrus (e.g. 2:12 μ[ ]αθηται)." However, I have also counted this as a correction: 2:12b.

Such disagreements are comparatively few in number, and it is certain that there are over 400 corrections in the extant papyrus, and of course there were many more in the missing portions of the codex.

For the sake of comparison, it may be noted here that Rhodes, "Corrections," adds 19 instances of correction to the material found in the editions as revised by Fee, Papyrus, pp. 85-97. These 19 cases are: 1:15a, 3:16, 4:29, 5:39, 5:43b, 6:5c, 6:41, 6:63a, 7:22, 7:28a, 7:37b, 9:19, 10:38b, 11:54a, 12:23, 12:44, 13:19b, 13:21c, and 14:10b. By the way, Rhodes' reading of 7:37b is accepted in Nestle-Aland, but Nestle-Aland does not indicate textual variation at the other two cases of correction of εκραζεν into εκραξεν (see "Corrections," p. 279). Two examples which Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 279, cites as doubtful (2:19 and 12:7) I consider too unclear to cite here.

Also included in our list in Appendix A are 14 readings not included in previous lists: 2:12b, 4:23a, 5:9, 5:16a, 5:33b, 5:36d, 6:7b, 6:47, 6:51, 6:68, 9:27, 11:41a, 13:10b, and 19:38. As we have seen, some of these are very doubtful and have been noted as such by earlier writers. But the following seem clear: 5:9, 5:16a, 11:41a, 13:10b, and 19:38. I also believe that a two-stage correction has occurred at 5:28a.

[27] I have followed Rhodes in his restoration of the original text at 5:11a ("Corrections," p. 275) and 6:60a (ibid., p. 272; cf. Fee, Papyrus, p. 90), believe that he may be correct at 13:19b ("Corrections," p. 273), but have not followed him at 8:42a ("Corrections," p. 273; Fee, Papyrus, p. 92), 10:38b ("Corrections," p. 273), 10:41 ("Corrections," p. 273), or 13:9 ("Corrections," p. 279). At 10:6a Rhodes follows the edition with εγνω ("Corrections," p. 275), but εγνω̄ seems certain as the original reading. At 8:42b both Rhodes ("Corrections," p. 277) and Aland thought that εξηληλυθα was original, but I believe that Fee (Papyrus, p. 92) is correct in seeing the beginning of εμαυτου.

At 4:39a I suggest that the original reading was ειπουσης, the reading of 185 $syr^{c,p}$. The first part of the original is illegible (Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 279; Fee, Papyrus, p. 88), but note that P^{66*} agrees alone with 185 at 14:23a.

Finally, at 11:45 it is unclear whether P^{66*} read ο or α. Rhodes ("Corrections," p. 278), Boismard, and Fee (Papyrus, p. 94) chose α, but Nestle-Aland has ο, which I believe is correct.

A few errors in Nestle-Aland may also be noted here. At 4:1 P^{66c} is cited simply as P^{66}, and at 5:36c P^{66*} is cited simply as P^{66}. And at 11:2-3 Nestle-Aland supposes that P^{66*} read (ησθενει) και εστειλεν. However, what Nestle-Aland thus takes as the original κ appears in fact to be the original ν of the original ασθενων, and thus I believe that Fee (Papyrus, p. 94) is correct in seeing the original reading as ασθενων απεστιλεν.

[28] Papyrus Bodmer II, p. 31.

[29] "Papyrus Bodmer II," col. 181.

[30] Papyrus, pp. 58-59.

[31] Papyrus Bodmer II, p. 32: "Ce genre de correction dont on ne peut déterminer qui est l'auteur . . . ." Cf. also Fee, Papyrus, pp. 59-60 and p. 60 n. 10, where he suggests that some deletions by dots in Jn 7 may be by a

second hand. But he notes that any such view is "tentative." Indeed, as Fee notes, the deletions are effected in such a variety of ways that any pattern is difficult to isolate. Cf. Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 272 n. 3: "Deletion is usually by erasure, but diagonal lines and superior dots (with or without parentheses) are also found."

[32] Papyrus, p. 59. Rhodes did not know of Fee's work, and just cites 13:19a without comment on the hand ("Corrections," p. 274 n. 4). And in fact Rhodes (p. 271) says: "Indeed, while it may be true that several hands have been at work here, it seems equally possible that the whole (corrections as well as the original transcription) is the work of a single scribe."

[33] Papyrus, p. 59.

[34] Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 280, cites 4:47, 5:39, 7:41, 13:7, 13:10c, and 14:12a. The editor notes 13:7, but not quite clearly, and Fee (Papyrus, p. 91 and p. 96) notes 7:41 and 14:12a. The original reading at 13:10c is very doubtful, as indicated by Fee (Papyrus, p. 95). And at 4:47 Fee believes (Papyrus, p. 88) that the correction was simply of an original article. However, I believe that Rhodes is correct in thinking that the article was added in a narrow space, and then erased.

Fee's work appeared shortly after Rhodes' article (see Papyrus, p. 57 n. 1), and thus Fee was unable to use fully what Rhodes presents (despite Fee's claim that "all of the data" are included in his work). In fact, Fee overlooks the two-stage correction at 5:39. On the other hand, Rhodes surely errs in his reading of 3:33, where he takes the correction to be simply to μαρτυριαν αυτος ("Corrections," p. 275). Fee (Papyrus, p. 67 and p. 87) gives the correct sequence.

Neither Fee nor Rhodes notes the two-stage correction at 5:28a. (The editor had already cited the addition of οι.) What appears to have taken place is that the scribe first wrote παντες, and then wrote παντες σοι by a dittography of the ς, a fault which the scribe himself is subject to. (Cf. 2:11c, 4:48b, 6:9a, as cited by Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 274 n. 5.) Then, the σ of σοι was erased, although its remains are clear in the left margin.

[35] "Corrections," p. 280.

[36] Ibid., p. 281. The nature of this second exemplar will be discussed below. (Although Rhodes says merely "[a]n

exemplar," I believe that he means that this was an exemplar other than the one from which the scribe copied. In any case, the textual relationships of the corrections indicate that readings from more than one manuscript were involved.)

[37] At 3:33 both the first and the second corrections are singular readings. And at 5:28a the second correction is of an obvious slip.

[38] That is, other than those differences which would occur naturally when letters are inserted between lines, between letters, in the margins, and so on. Fee, Papyrus, p. 59, comments: "The letters of many of the additions are not as well-formed as those of the original text, but for the most part they are not so different as to suggest a second hand. Probably any differences are the result of the scribe's being less a calligrapher when he has turned corrector: the letters appear to reflect more haste, and they are usually smaller."

[39] "Corrections," p. 271 and p. 281.

[40] "Papyrus Bodmer II," col. 164.

[41] See also Fee, Papyrus, p. 94. The contrast in quality of the original plates and the later ones is apparent here.

[42] See note 38 above. Of course, in this case the most any differences would show is that this correction was due to a second hand, and not that two scribes were responsible for the writing of the text of the papyrus.

[43] Of the "approximately 450" corrections cited by Fee (Papyrus, p. 57), "approximately 235" are said by him to be "corrections of scribal slips."

[44] Martin, Papyrus Bodmer II, p. 31; Aland, "Papyrus Bodmer II," col. 181; Fee, Papyrus, p. 58; Rhodes, "Corrections," pp. 272-73 (where a useful classification is given).

[45] This correction is not noted in the edition or by Fee, but is cited by Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 272.

[46] The scribe's tendency to confuse αι and ε played a role here; see Fee, Papyrus, pp. 131-36. Rhodes, "Corrections,"

p. 272, seems to me to confuse the way in which this error occurred when he writes: "the conjunction και was threatened with elimination due to its itacistic confusion with the following κε-."

[47] Note, by the way, that the stages in the copying here are syllables, which are, as we shall see later, the units which the scribe tends to copy generally.

[48] "Corrections," pp. 272-73.

[49] Rhodes, *ibid*., p. 273, says that the original reading was εν αυτω, but the remains appear not to fit this hypothesis.

[50] This correction, like the previous one, was first noted by Rhodes, *ibid*.

[51] This is the suggestion of Rhodes, *ibid*.

[52] See Rhodes' comments and examples, *ibid*., pp. 273-75.

[53] This aspect of the corrections has been often noted. See Metzger, *Text*, p. 40; A. F. J. Klijn, "Papyrus Bodmer II (John I-XIV) and the Text of Egypt," *New Testament Studies*, 3 (1956-57), p. 334; Heinrich Zimmermann, "Papyrus Bodmer II und seine Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte des Johannes-Evangeliums," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, Neue Folge 2 (1958), pp. 222-24; Rhodes, "Corrections," pp. 275-79 (in these "significant corrections" both the original reading and the correction often have considerable support).

[54] *Papyrus*, pp. 60-71.

[55] Fee does, though, note that the corrector "did more often choose to read away from than toward the Western tradition" (*ibid*., p. 71). Indeed, Fee gives 29 examples of movement away from the Western text (*ibid*., pp. 62-63), but presents only 4 cases of movement toward the Western text (*ibid*., pp. 66-67).

[56] *Ibid*., p. 71. In this connection one may note Fee's discussion and criticism (*ibid*., p. 4 and pp. 25-26) of the hypothesis of Boismard and Hartke that two *Vorlagen* were used by the scribe in the initial copying.

[57] *Ibid*., p. 67. See note 16 above.

[58] Three more are singular according to the evidence in Tischendorf: 3:31a, 13:16, and 14:14.

[59] Fee, Papyrus, p. 43 and p. 103, just cites P^{66} as reading παρα σοι προ του τον κοσμον ειναι, but considers this singular. (I believe that a better way of viewing this reading [in fact that of P^{66*}] would be to take it as agreeing with D in the location of παρα σοι, and as agreeing with the other manuscripts in having προ του τον κοσμον ειναι.)

Martin and Barns, Supplément, Nouvelle édition, p. 21, say that παρα σοι "fortasse delentur in P post ειχον." However, the plate makes clear that neither occurrence of παρα σοι has been marked for deletion.

[60] Papyrus Bodmer II, p. 26 (and see pp. 26-27).

[61] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 110 (and see pp. 110-11). The figures reported by Colwell result in the following comparison:

Itacistic spellings	P^{75}	P^{45}	P^{66}
Per page	.7	1.5	2.7
Per verse	.1	.1	.5

The figures for P^{45} are misleadingly low (especially for the verses) because of the fragmentary nature of the codex.

[62] These would be singular by our criteria, but see note 18 above.

[63] Papyrus, pp. 128-36. Fee's lists confirm Martin's claim (Papyrus Bodmer II, p. 26) that P^{66} contains no example of οι/υ confusion.

[64] BDF, §17; Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, Vol. III, pp. 93-94; von Soden, Die Schriften, Untersuchungen, pp. 1377-78. Note that P^{66} finds support from W^{supp} in the same spelling at 1:13.

[65] Gignac, Grammar, pp. 124-25.

[66] Ibid., pp. 130-31. It is interesting that at Jn 7:43 both P^{75*} and B* make the same error (corrected by P^{75c} and B^3), as noted by Colwell, "External Evidence," p. 6.

[67] Gignac, Grammar, p. 108. An example of ματυρω for μαρτυρω from the 6th/7th century is cited there.

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 155-56. Although this is listed as though P^{66} had an orthographic variation from Θ, in fact of course, P^{66} presents the usual spelling. But it is clear that P^{66} and Θ differ only by this orthographic difference.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 113, and see BDF, §372(1).

[70] The addition is before a stop; see Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 113.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 287 (where μετοξυ is cited often).

[72] *Ibid.*, pp. 276-77. On the examples cited by Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 136, see note 19 above; 20:18 will be considered later as a confusion with the augment.

[73] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 211, says that θυρουρος is "the normal spelling in the papyri." P^{66} also has θυρουρος at Jn 10:3, but there it is supported by D. (D* also has θυρουρω at Mk 13:34, the only other occurrence of the word in the New Testament.)

[74] *The Bodmer Papyrus*, p. 13.

[75] Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 58 n. 5; Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 281 n. 2.

[76] See Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, p. 27, and Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 274, item (a).

[77] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 111.

[78] *Ibid.*, pp. 111-12. In his "External Evidence," p. 6, Colwell says that there is "a total of two hundred" nonsense readings in P^{66}, but this is probably intended as a round figure.

[79] "External Evidence," pp. 6-7. On p. 7 he lists 17 (since he places 6:52 and 6:53 together), and notes that 2 more (2:11 and 3:6) are given on p. 6.

[80] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[81] See Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 86.

[82] See Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 116-17.

[83] See Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 91.

UMI

[84] It is just the active form, which Birdsall indeed thinks is probably original here (*The Bodmer Papyrus*, p. 16).

[85] Colwell, by a printing error, has εν εσυαυτω.

[86] See LSJ, *s.v.*

[87] Metzger, *Text*, p. 40, says that it is "a picturesque word," and Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 55, says that it "is a more expressive--and accurate--word at this point than νιπτηρα."

[88] LSJ, *s.v.* (A). Apparently the only variations involving γνωστος in the New Testament (besides this one) are Jn 18:16 γνωστος: γνωριμος N, and Ac 15:18 γνωστα: γνωστον P^{74} A D : φανερα 241. (At 18:15 P^{66} preserves only]τος in the upper margin.)

[89] LSJ, *s.v.* (B).

[90] Colwell, by a printing error, has αλλοι ειπον σοι.

[91] As Colwell, "External Evidence," p. 6, notes, this sort of duplication at the end of a line is a "habit" of the scribe. Note the corrected readings at 2:22, 3:2a, 6:9a, 7:44a, 13:32.

[92] Note that at 6:63c the scribe originally dropped the third syllable of the same word, but then corrected his error.

[93] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 116.

[94] This could be taken as an orthographic confusion; cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 262 and p. 264. These pronouns are, of course, frequently confused in New Testament manuscripts; see Metzger, *Text*, pp. 191-92.

[95] Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 274 n. 4, claims that the omission is by homoeoteleuton from αυ*του* to προ *του*. But this is impossible, since such a leap would result in the omission of του as well.

[96] In fact, many of these readings should probably be considered orthographic in nature rather than nonsense, but of course such wildness in orthography would be an indication of carelessness, also.

[97] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 114.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Ibid., p. 118.

[100] Ibid., p. 121.

[101] Ibid., p. 123. On pp. 121-23 Colwell mentions 17 specific readings of P^{66}. However, 9 of these have been corrected: 12:16d, 2:15a, 2:11a-b (Colwell has 3:3), 8:48, 6:60a, 5:29b, 7:40a, 10:6b, 5:28b. (These are listed in Colwell's order of presentation.) One reading is non-singular (11:49), and so only 7 readings are singular after correction: 18:37, 8:40, 9:4, 13:1a, 8:25b (here the correction itself), 13:33, 15:4.

[102] Papyrus, p. 7 and p. 57 n. 3.

[103] Ibid., p. 75.

[104] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 118.

[105] Papyrus Bodmer II, p. 30.

[106] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 118.

[107] "Papyrus Bodmer II," col. 181.

[108] A modern parallel might be judging a scholar's accuracy on the basis of his rough drafts and notes, and ignoring the finished products. Of course, it usually happens now that rough drafts disappear from view, while the initial effort of the scribe of P^{66} remains physically part of the finished product.

[109] One may compare the conclusions reached by Rhodes, "Corrections," pp. 280-81:

> "(1) The scribe of P^{66} may have been wild and unpredictable, but he was not unaware of his faults. Although his hand is generally neat and well-balanced, when he recognized himself in error he did not hesitate to make a correction for fear of marring the appearance of the page.
>
> (2) After the transcription of P^{66} was completed, a preliminary check was made of the manuscript (whether by the scribe or by a more experienced colleague) by someone who was concerned with matters of orthography (even

> itacisms), but also with an interest in seeing that the sentences should read sensibly.
>
> (3) A second review of the manuscript was then made with a greater concern for transcriptional accuracy. An exemplar was employed at this stage. It is not our purpose here to determine its character, but it must have been remarkably similar to the Nestle text, though with a stronger 'Caesarean' colouring."

It should be recalled that, as Rhodes himself says (see note 32 above), all of this activity may well have been done by the scribe, and indeed I believe that the most likely hypothesis is that virtually all the correcting was performed by the scribe.

[110] "Papyrus Bodmer II," col. 180.

[111] *Papyrus Bodmer II*, p. 10: "On peut penser à un scriptorium rattaché à quelque monastère qui, sans prétendre produire des exemplaires de luxe, visait tout au moins une certaine qualité." Both Colwell ("Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 118) and Fee (*Papyrus*, p. 82 n. 20) refer to a scriptorium, but do not specify whether it would be Christian.

[112] "Papyrus Bodmer II," cols. 180-81.

[113] *Ibid.*, col. 181.

[114] *Ibid.*

[115] "Erwägungen zur synoptischen Textkritik," *New Testament Studies*, 6 (1959-60), pp. 281-82.

[116] The harmonizations are discussed in detail below.

[117] See Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, pp. 27-28.

[118] The correction at 3:8a is noted in the edition; the one at 6:63a, which is not so clear, is cited by Rhodes, "Corrections," p. 273 (along with 3:8a). It is interesting that the scribe seems to have caught his "error" at the same place each time.

[119] Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 58 n. 4, gives the same explanation of this reading.

[120] Martin, *Supplément*, p. 6; Martin and Barns, *Supplément*, *Nouvelle édition*, p. 8.

[121] "Bemerkungen zum Alter und zur Entstehung des Christogrammes anhand von Beobachtungen bei P^{66} und P^{75}," *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967), pp. 173-79.

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

[123] *Ibid.*, p. 178.

[124] Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 75.

[125] Two further points may be mentioned here. First, one may contrast the extensive correcting in P^{66} with the very limited correcting in P^{45}. This difference might suggest that the scribe of P^{45} is more accurate than the scribe of P^{66}. But in at least one respect this is clearly not so. For the scribe of P^{66} transposes less often than does the scribe of P^{45} precisely because the scribe of P^{66} is willing to correct the transpositions which he catches, while the scribe of P^{45} never corrects his many transpositions. See the section on transpositions below for details on this matter.

Secondly, it is interesting that the scribes of P^{66}, P^{75}, and ℵ, all were influenced by the context at Jn 9:17 to write σεαυτου for αυτου. (I assume that these errors were independent; note that συ precedes and σου follows.) Of course, the error does not reflect well on the accuracy of any of these three scribes, but surely it would be misleading to judge the scribe of P^{66} equally harshly with the scribe of P^{75} here, since the scribe of P^{66} did correct himself. (At least, I assume that it was the scribe.) Considering the papyri before correction would place the scribes of P^{66} and P^{75} on the same level, while in fact the scribe of P^{66} manages (eventually) to write the correct text here.

[126] It may be noted here that Fee's approach is somewhat different. He analyzes the "textual characteristics of P^{66}" by utilizing the readings of P^{66} which differ from the Neutral tradition (*Papyrus*, p. 37 and see pp. 36-56 generally), thus including singular as well as non-singular

readings. Then he analyzes the "scribal characteristics of P^{66}" by looking at the corrections (*ibid*., pp. 57-75). Our methodology focusses on the singular readings, and so the treatment here overlaps these two phases of Fee's investigation.

[127] By the way, the fact that W^{supp} adds δε at another place suggests that the contrast here is naturally felt. One may compare the rendering in Today's English Version, based on the Greek of the United Bible Societies' edition: "God gave the Law through Moses; *but* grace and truth . . . ." (Italics mine.)

[128] This could be a dittography of ις after αυτοις; cf. the example at Mt 19:8 cited by Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 57.

[129] Here, of course, there is also the change from αυτου to εαυτου.

[130] It is possible that 6:69 is also conflate. Moreover, one conflate reading has been corrected: 16:19.

[131] See Fee, *Papyrus*, pp. 79-80: "To drop a full syllable while copying is a *regular* habit of this scribe."

[132] Thus, among the singulars there are four omissions of an article to one addition. This indicates a tendency toward omission of articles, a tendency not noted by Fee in his discussion (*Papyrus*, pp. 52-54). Before proper nouns the ratio is three to zero.

[133] Cf. BDF, §257(3), with reference to Jn 1:14 *et al*.

[134] Cf. BDF, §260.

[135] *Ibid*.

[136] This leap suggests that the scribe may have, in reading or in thought, punctuated Jn 1:3-4 as: ουδεν· ο γεγονεν εν αυτω. See Teeple and Walker, "Notes," p. 149, and Aland, "Über die Bedeutung eines Punktes," *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament*, ed. Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, Studies and Documents, Vol. XXIX (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967), p. 186 n. 20.

Note that the scribe omitted εν after εμεινεν at

UMI

both 7:9b and 11:6, but corrected himself both times.

[137] Here there is also the resulting transposition.

[138] This omission creates asyndeton and has the support of it^{a}. Birdsall, The Bodmer Papyrus, p. 13, says that on "the stylistic criterion of asyndeton" some of P^{66}'s omissions of conjunctions may be original. However, Fee, Papyrus, p. 45, gives a convincing analysis of this particular omission: "Since the scribe probably copied by syllables, a singular reading such as this, which involves only a syllable, is suspect as a mere scribal lapse." See also Fee's comments concerning shorter readings generally in Papyrus, pp. 79-80.

[139] See the references in Chapter II, note 57.

[140] See Brown, John, p. 134.

[141] Other manuscripts have omitted verses 15 and 16 by another leap (which involves the repetition of more letters).

[142] This omission is of 20 letters, and is thus about the same length as the omission at 13:19a (17 letters). Since there is no apparent reason for the omission at 19:38, we might again speculate that one line of the scribe's Vorlage has been skipped.

[143] I follow Metzger, Commentary, p. 233, in seeing the text of P^{66} as a corruption from the text of P^{75} B C* θ f^{13} pc.

[144] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 122, points out the "trouble lies in the unconnected και υμιν λεγω αρτι" in Jn 13:33. He then claims that the scribe of P^{66} added πλην to the majority text after λεγω (and a high point), while manuscripts 1 and 565 add πλην after αρτι. Colwell then says: "These corruptions are alternative ways of clearing up the difficulty." Fee, Papyrus, p. 55, follows Colwell in seeing the reading of P^{66} here as the result of a clarifying addition to the majority text.

However, this scenario seems implausible. Πλην does not occur in the context, and indeed is, as Fee remarks, "non-Johannine." (It does occur in K pm at Jn 8:10.) It would thus seem to be a rather extraordinary coincidence that more than one scribe would independently choose this word as a means of clarifying Jn 13:33. Rather, it seems much easier to suppose that the scribe of P^{66} transposed the reading of 1 565 pc, perhaps by misunderstanding a marginal notation of πλην in his *Vorlage*. If I am correct here, then of course, P^{66} is actually a witness to the existence of the reading of 1 565 pc in the year 200.

[145] The text here is not quite certain, although I have followed Martin and Barns in their reconstruction. It appears that not enough space is present for the scribe to have added εις τοπον λεγομενον in the upper margin, and that some word (ending with a ν represented by the visible line) is present after δε. Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 122, incorrectly cites P^{66} for Γαββαθα λεγομενον.

[146] The reading of P^{66} could also be a harmonization to the ουδεν ευρισκω αιτιον εν τω ανθρωπω τουτω of Lk 23:4.

[147] *Papyrus*, pp. 42-43. He also includes 17:5 here, based on his misreading of the manuscript (see note 59 above).

[148] *Ibid*., p. 37. Fee's list (pp. 102-3) of singular transpositions does not include 13:33 (see note 144 above) or 19:13, but does include the non-singular readings 1:27b, 3:4, 8:55, 14:2, 17:14, and 18:10, as well as the non-transposition 17:5.

[149] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 117. Compare the remarks of Greeven cited earlier.

[150] The 11 are: 2:11b, 4:9d, 5:5, 6:5b, 6:9b, 7:46a, 10:4, 10:28, 13:20c, 14:2a, and 15:16a; the other three are 7:52, 9:10a, and 9:30.

[151] The editors cite P^{66} as omitting υμας sec in 15:16, and Nestle-Aland follows them. It appears that some crowding of letters is necessary at the end of the line in order to have the usual text, but Colwell is clearly correct (see Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 97) in noting that an original transposition of ινα υμας has been corrected.

[152] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 117.

[153] We may also note the non-singular readings 1:27a and 1:27b, where ικανος is substituted from Mt 3:11, Mk 1:7, and Lk 3:16, and where the word order of Mk 1:7 and Lk 3:16 is followed. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 113, observes: "In both P^{66} and P^{75} the Baptist's statement of

his unworthiness in John uses the language of the Synoptic Gospels." In fact, it seems quite likely that at 1:27a and 1:27b we have independent harmonizations by the various scribes.

[154] Cf. the remarks by Colwell, "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 113; Fee, Papyrus, p. 54; and Metzger, Commentary, p. 215. It is unclear whether the reading of P^{66} should be viewed as an addition to the text in P^{75}, a substitution in the text in C^{3}, or as a conflation of these two readings. In any case, the influence of the papallels could well have played a role.

[155] Fee, Papyrus, p. 55, says simply that the reading of P^{66} is "more expressive" than the other reading.

[156] The reading εληλυθεν of ς rell is, by the way, probably harmonized to the εληλυθεν η ωρα of Jn 12:23. D's reading may have been influenced by Jn 7:6. (Von Soden notes both of these parallels.)

[157] See note 146 above.

[158] As noted by Fee, Papyrus, p. 54. BDF, §232(1), comments that Jn 1:48 is the only use in the Johannine literature of υπο with the accusative.

[159] Fee, Papyrus, p. 54, says: "The redundant Ιησους is probably a careless harmonization to the ordinary Johannine ειπεν αυτοις Ιησους." This is possible, but the proximity of another occurrence of ιησους would have made it unnecessary for the scribe to recall the general formula.

[160] Birdsall, The Bodmer Papyrus, p. 13, says that the tendency toward ουδεπω "may also arise from stylistic editorial standards," since ουδεπω "may" have been "stylistically preferable." However, Birdsall cites no evidence for this claim.

[161] The interpretation of the end of Jn 8:25 is unclear (cf. Metzger, Commentary, pp. 223-24), and both Robert W. Funk, "Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}) and John 8;25," Harvard Theological Review, 51 (1958), pp. 95-100, and Edgar R. Smothers, "Two Readings in Papyrus Bodmer II," Harvard Theological Review, 51 (1958), pp. 111-22, have defended the reading of P^{66} here. On the other hand, Colwell, "Scribal

Habits," Studies, p. 122, says: "The very difficult passage in John 8:25 is cleared up [in P^{66}] by prefixing 'I said to you.'" Brown, John, p. 348, notes that the reading of P^{66} "is a tempting reading which makes good sense." Of course, this fact doubtless explains P^{66}'s addition here.

Cf. also BDF, §300(2), where the reading is said to be "from the margin." Metzger, Commentary, p. 224, also refers to this reading as "a marginal correction which may be by the original scribe." Of course, such marginal additions are common in P^{66}, and here the hand certainly appears very close indeed to that of the scribe. It is perhaps worth noting that there are four examples in P^{66} of a correction which is a singular addition: 3:33, 8:25b, 14:26, and 17:5. We have already described 17:5 as a conflate reading resulting from an uncompleted correction to a different exemplar. But the other three cases appear to have arisen when the scribe, looking later at his text, found some difficulty in what he read, and thus added a word or phrase from the immediate context for the purpose of clarification. In fact, in all three cases he could have obtained the words merely from the previous verse. (Moreover, at 3:33 the scribe first added the word as object of the verb [see Fee, Papyrus, p. 87], and then altered it to be the subject.)

This method of explanation seems to account adequately for the reading of P^{66} at 8:25b, and thus to remove it as a candidate for preserving the original text.

By the way, most manuscripts read ειπον ουν υμιν in vs. 24, but P^{66} ℵ pc have only ειπον υμιν. Thus, P^{66}'s addition could have come without change from what occurred a few lines earlier (although there is the itacistic shift from υμειν to υμιν, perhaps made to save space in the margin).

[162] See also the variations between προβατον and προβατιον in Jn 21:16-17.

[163] Fee, Papyrus, p. 55, says that this addition "appears to be in the interest of a more direct answer to Jesus' question." This is true, but the word also comes from the immediate context.

[164] It is unclear whether the preposition was added to the reading found in P^{45}, or replaced the preposition found in D.

[165] This is the most extensive re-writing to be found in P^{66}. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 122, says: "But more

rigorous editing (or erroneous harmonization) is needed to explain 15:4, where 'neither can you unless you abide in me' is reduced to 'so also (is) he who abides in me.'"

[166] For πλειονα in vs. 2 the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland had P^{66} ℵ Cl as reading πλειω. But Martin and Barns, *Supplément*, *Nouvelle édition*, read [πλειο]ν̣α̣, and it does seem that the very fragmentary remains are the lower right portion of ν and the lower part of λ.

[167] Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 53, says that the idiom απεκριθη (ιησους) και ειπεν occurs 17 times in the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland. By the way, the *Vorlage* of P^{66} at 10:34 is unclear, but some rearrangement as well as either addition or omission has occurred.

[168] Martin and Barns, *Supplément*, *Nouvelle édition*, read: [. . . απ/ε]π̣εμψας here, and the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland cites P^{66vid} for απεπεμψας. However, there seems to be no justification for reading the prefix απ-. Indeed, the space appears to be against its presence, and αποπεμπφ does not occur in the New Testament. Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 122, has επεμψας as the reading, and I follow him.

[169] Brown, *John*, p. 134, says: "'Send' with reference to the mission of Jesus is expressed in John by two verbs without any apparent distinction of meaning: *pempein* (26 times) and *apostellein* (18 times)."

[170] *Papyrus*, p. 39.

[171] See BDF, §451 ("commonest by far in Jn"), and Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*, 2.b ("den Übergang zu etwas Neuem zu vollziehen. So besonders im vierten Ev.").

Jack Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1974), p. 94, remarks on 18:38a: "The use of οὖν, 'therefore,' to indicate a response is fairly characteristic of the Gospel according to John (e.g., Jn 4:9, 48; 6:53, etc.), so it could be original here in P^{66}. On the other hand, it is perhaps more probable that it would be added by a scribe who was already well familiar with this usage in the Gospel, than that it would be omitted if it stood already in the text from which he was copying."

The external evidence would seem to make the latter hypothesis certain. Addition of ουν is also a characteristic of the correcting activity in P^{66}; see A. F. J. Klijn, *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Part Two: 1949-1969, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XXI (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), p. 43, who notes eight places where P^{66c} adds ουν to P^{66*} (perhaps with other changes as well): 4:48a, 4:52, 7:30, 7:40a, 9:10a, 10:7, 12:2a, 19:4. As Klijn notes, this tendency is just one example of the general tendency of the corrections toward, as Fee puts it, "a smoother, fuller text" (*Papyrus*, p. 73). And it happens that in the case of adding ουν this tendency can also be seen as a tendency to harmonize with the general usage in John.

[172] The scribe had just seen εν τω ονοματι αυτου in 20:31. Jean de Savignac, "Les fragments du papyrus Bodmer II de l'Évangile johannique," *Scriptorium*, 14 (1960), pp. 335-37, argues that the addition at Jn 21:6, found with minor variations in P^{66} $\aleph^{ca}$ Ψ it^{q} vg^{mss} cop^{sa} eth Cyr, may well be authentic. However, Savignac does not discuss the reading ονοματι.

[173] I have here counted 18:38c as a harmonization, and not considered 6:69 to be an addition (see note 154 above).

[174] See Chapter II, note 97. Of course, the reading of 2768 could have come from P^{66} just as easily by the reverse confusion, and it is possible that these two scribes could have made their additions independently. Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 55, says: "The addition of εαυτης seems to be a curious emphasis on the fact that Mary remained at home, while Martha and Jesus were outside the village."

[175] See Chapter III, note 271. Colwell, "External Evidence," classifies these two readings as nonsense readings, and calls attention to the fact that P^{66} goes on to write την σαρκα at 6:54 and 6:56.

[176] Birdsall, *The Bodmer Papyrus*, p. 13, says that P^{66}'s preference for ουδε εν may "arise from stylistic editorial standards," and refers (n. 2) to BDF, §302(2), on this. Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 54, remarks: "It [P^{66}] seems to have a tendency to read ουδε εν for ουδεν (3:27 with P^{75} B; 5:19, 30; but cf. 1:3)."

Fee thus overlooks the best evidence for this tendency in P^{66}: the singular reading at 8:28. At the other three texts the support for ουδε εν is:

3:27 P^{66} P^{75} B 472

5:19 P^{66} f^{1} 124 565 660
5:30 P^{66} G pc

On the other hand, at 1:3 ουδεν is read by P^{66} ℵ* D f^{1} 71 1071. In connection with this last reading, Finegan, Encountering New Testament Manuscripts, p. 171, comments: "But here, in spite of that apparent preference elsewhere, P^{66} reads οὐδέν, which makes it a weighty reading. A change from the less strong ('nothing') to the strongest possible ('no single thing') statement is more likely than the reverse."

[177] Cf. BDF, §68; Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, Vol. III, p. 122; Westcott and Hort, Appendix, p. 168; von Soden, Die Schriften, Untersuchungen, p. 1397.

[178] See BDF, §93; Westcott and Hort, Appendix, p. 175; von Soden, Die Schriften, Untersuchungen, p. 1391.

[179] See the references cited in Chapter II, note 100, and Fee, Papyrus, pp. 137-38.

[180] Ibid., p. 51 (with the evidence on pp. 46-51).

[181] Cf. Chapter III, note 275.

[182] Fee, Papyrus, p. 46, notes that both of these "occur in a logion of Jesus, and in each case the reading of P^{66} is more 'existential' for the scribe's contemporaries."

[183] Ibid., p. 39. Fee cites οπου ειμι εγω as occurring at 7:34, 7:36, 12:26, 14:3, and 17:24.

[184] Ibid., p. 40. P^{66}'s reading at 1:50 is clearly a harmonization to the context, and we might so view the reading at 11:31; however, there the second element is not quite the same as the first.

[185] Ibid., p. 43.

[186] BDF, §462.

[187] Papyrus, p. 44. Fee (p. 44 n. 21) also cites Birdsall, The Bodmer Papyrus, p. 13: "In respect of the stylistic criterion of asyndeton we may conclude then that the papyrus probably preserves a number of original readings, but also displays a marked tendency to smooth over certain harshnesses in the original text."

[188] See notes 127 and 171 above.

[189] Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 44 n. 15, misses 19:6.

[190] I suppose that the simplest origin is the reading of Θ^{c}, and in fact the transition either way between δε and τε would be easy enough (cf. BDF, §443[1]). Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 67, does not even give the reading of Θ in connection with P^{66}'s reading at 12:22. However, he does note (p. 45) that P^{66} has a non-singular substitution of δε for τε at 4:42 (see p. 104).

[191] These are the only two singular readings included by Fee, *Papyrus*, p. 44 n. 16.

[192] See note 171 above.

[193] Fee, *Papyrus*, pp. 52-54.

[194] *Ibid*., p. 54.

[195] See Richard C. Nevius, "The Use of the Definite Article with 'Jesus' in the Fourth Gospel," *New Testament Studies*, 12 (1965-66), pp. 81-85, and Fee's comment in *Papyrus*, p. 52 n. 41. Subsequently, Fee has presented a more comprehensive analysis in his "The Use of the Definite Article with Personal Names in the Gospel of John," *New Testament Studies*, 17 (1970-71), pp. 168-83.

[196] It may also be the case that the scribe omits the article before ιησους at 10:34. Note also that among the asterisked readings P^{66} adds the article before a proper noun at 11:54a, and omits articles before proper nouns at 11:14, 12:2b, and 18:38b.

[197] Cf. note 132 above. Fee (*Papyrus*, p. 73; "The Use of the Definite Article," p. 174) says that the article is added eight times before proper nouns within the corrections of P^{66}, and refers to 1:46, 8:25, 11:35, 12:7, 12:16, 13:21, 13:23, and 18:40. However, it is not at all clear that a correction has been made at 12:7 (Rhodes does not cite it, and the editor has no note). It is true that the article ο appears unusually close to the preceding ν. But there was clearly no lack of space there, and so the position of the article would seem to be the result of the scribe's habit of spacing letters irregularly, rather than the result of squeezing in a letter which was originally omitted.

On the other hand, Fee fails to note the corrections at 4:6a and 19:13a, where the article has been added before ουν followed by a proper name. Thus, there are nine

UMI

corrections which add the article before proper nouns: 1:46, 4:6a, 8:25a, 11:35, 12:16a, 13:21a, 13:23b, 18:40b, 19:13a.

At 4:47 there is an addition followed by a deletion, and at 12:22 the correction omits the articles before two proper nouns.

Fee's conclusion is that the corrections in P^{66} "clearly show that where one does find 'recension' in the second century, it is toward the use of the article, not toward an anarthrous text" ("The Use of the Definite Article," p. 179). I believe, though, that the tendency of P^{66} after correction is still the most valuable way to interpret its evidence. Indeed, since so many of the corrections in P^{66} are of omissions of one type or another, at least some of the omissions of articles were doubtless mere blunders, and their corrections were thus not the mark of any kind of "recension." Note, for example, that P^{66*} is singular at 4:6a and 19:13a, and has very weak support at a few of the other readings.

[198] Gignac, Grammar, p. 158.

[199] *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.

[200] See Martini, *Il problema*, pp. 116-17.

CHAPTER VI

THE SCRIBE OF P^{72}

Papyrus Bodmer VII-VIII, designated P^{72}, constitutes two sections of a collection of diverse literary works.[1] In this collection Papyrus Bodmer VII, which contains Jude, is followed by four other sections (written by three other scribes) and then by Papyrus Bodmer VIII, which contains 1 Peter and 2 Peter (and is now in the Vatican Library[2]). However, the same scribe copied all three of these books of the New Testament.[3] The original editor, Testuz, dated P^{72} to the third century,[4] but Aland also cites "III-IV,"[5] apparently because the final collection of sections was made early in the fourth century.[6] In any case, the only witness of comparable age to any of these epistles is the very brief P^{78}, although P^{72} is not much older than the four witnesses from the fourth century: P^{81}, ℵ, B, and 0206.[7]

There are available in the edition of Testuz plates of only the first page of Papyrus Bodmer VII (i.e., Jd 1-4 παρεισεδυσαν) and the first page of Papyrus Bodmer VIII (i.e., 1 Pe 1:1-4). The edition is provided with a superficial apparatus, which utilizes only the twenty-third edition of Nestle-Aland and the 1958 British and Foreign Bible Society edition.[8] Such an apparatus will necessarily be of rather restricted interest, and it happens that Testuz does not always interpret his sources correctly.[9] Fortunately, though, there is also available the transcription and facsimiles of Papyrus Bodmer VIII in the edition of Martini, with an apparatus based on the ninth edition of Merk.[10] There are very few discrepancies between the transcriptions by Testuz and by Martini,[11] and so we can have confidence in the resulting collation. However, it must be emphasized that P^{72} is the only one of our six papyri for which plates have not been published. Consequently, it has been impossible to check and even to correct the editors of P^{72}, as we have been able to do for the other five papyri.

There are two substantial publications by Massaux concerning the readings of P^{72} which would appear to provide virtually all the textual information we need for Jude and 1 Peter.[12] Massaux claims to present a thorough examination of all the readings of P^{72} (except for those arising from certain orthographic variations[13]) on the basis of Tischendorf, von Soden, and Nestle-Aland.[14] It is, however, regrettable that Massaux' work, in spite of its appearance of care and completeness,[15] is rendered almost worthless because of its high rate of error. Since no analysis of Massaux' collation seems to have been reported in the literature, a few of the problems will be cited here.

In the first place, Massaux takes no note of the corrections published in Volume III of Tischendorf, and thus occasionally makes an error.[16] Secondly, though, and much more importantly, Massaux' collation of Jude fails to take into account the fact that the numbers used by Tischendorf are not the Gregory numbers. Thus, although Massaux does convert von Soden's symbols into Gregory symbols, he cites Tischendorf's numbers (for manuscripts of the Acts and Catholic Epistles) directly without any conversion. Accordingly, already at the inscription we find thorough confusion in Massaux' citations, which include: επιστολη ιουδα 96, επιστολη ιουδα του αποστολου 73, του αγιου αποστολου ιουδα επιστολη 70 79, etc.[17] That none of 96, 73, 70, and 79 even contains Jude is a clue that something has gone amiss here. And, of course, what has gone amiss is that these are Tischendorf's numbers for manuscripts of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, which must be converted to: 460, 436, 131, and 451.

The result of such confusion is often to increase the length of Massaux' citations, since one manuscript will be cited under both its Tischendorf number and its

Gregory number (as converted from von Soden). Thus, at Jd 5 Tischendorf cites for ιησους: A B 6 7 13 29 66**, which are (in Gregory numbers): A B 6 2298 33 323 424**. Von Soden cites (in Gregory numbers): B A 33 81 88 1739 2298 323. Massaux mixes these two lists, drops the "**" entirely from the citation of 66 (= 424),[18] and adds 935,[19] so as to produce the following citation: A B 6 7 13 29 33 66 81 88 323 935 1739 2298.[20] This list *should* be: A B 6 33 81 88 323 424** 1739 2298.

Fortunately, Massaux does not repeat this confusion in his subsequent article on 1 Peter. However, rather than noting that his work on Jude suffers from this systematic error, Massaux refers to that work with no word of warning to the reader.[21] But even with this error no longer posing a problem, his work on 1 Peter is far from reliable. Indeed, a simple check of Massaux' collation with respect to the present list of singulars in P^{72} produced a long list of errors and omissions.[22] As a consequence, studies of P^{72} must basically start anew, and Massaux' "evidence" would be best left alone.[23]

In his study of P^{72} and B Kubo presents a brief analysis of the scribal characteristics of the scribe of P^{72}, along with a classification of the readings of P^{72} into orthographic variants, obvious scribal errors, and singular readings, with a further division of the singular readings into substitutions, omissions, additions, and transpositions. Unfortunately, Kubo's lists are neither complete nor totally accurate,[24] although he does have some comments on particular readings which will be referred to later in our discussion.

Our list of singulars, then, was constructed in the usual way,[25] and an additional comparison was made with 1739, since P^{72} is known to have textual relationships with the Alexandrian witnesses.[26] However, no reading was excluded as a result of this further check. Accordingly, the singular readings of P^{72} are as follows.

Jude

3 ποιουμενος ς rell : ποιησαμενος P^{72}

(o) 4a προγεγραμμενοι ς rell : προγεγραμενοι P^{72}

4b μονον ς rell : om P^{72c} : νομον P^{72*}

4c δεσποτην ς rell : ημων δεσποτην P^{72} Lcf :
om 378 2147

4d ημων ιησουν χριστον ς rell : $\overline{\iota\eta\nu}$ (= ιησουν)
$\overline{\chi\rho\nu}$ (= χριστον) ημων P^{72} : ιησουν χριστον
181 1881 1898 pc : ημων ιησουν 1837 :
υμων ιησουν χριστον 1241

5a παντα ℵ A B C^{2} P Ψ 33 1739 al :
παντας P^{72} syr^{ph} : τουτο ς rell

5b ο ϑεος C^{2} 623 pc : ο κυριος ς C* K L pm :
κυριος ℵ Ψ : $\overline{\vartheta\varsigma}$ (= ϑεος) $\overline{\chi\rho\varsigma}$ (= χριστος)
P^{72} (Cl^{lat}: dominus deus) : ιησους A B 6
33 81 323 424** 1241 1739 1881 2298 2344 pc :
ο ιησους 88 915

(o) 5c εκ γης ς rell : εγ γης P^{72} : εκ της Ψ
1829 : om 2138*(?) 2147

7a γομορρα ς rell : γομορα P^{72}

(n) 7b ετερας ς rell : τερας P^{72}

(o) 7c προκειντα ς rell : προσκειντε P^{72}

8a μεν ς rell : om P^{72} vg^{mss} $cop^{bo^{pt}}$

(o) 8b βλασφημουσιν ς rell : βασφημουσιν P^{72}

Jude

9 μιχαηλ ς rell : $\overline{\text{μιχαης}}$ P^{72}

11 βαλααμ ς rell : βαλαακ P^{72}

12 συνευωχουμενοι ς rell : συνευχομενοι P^{72}

(o) 13 θαλασσης ς rell : θαλασης P^{72}

14 μυριασιν αγιων αγγελων ℵ 104 pc : αγιων αγγελων μυριασιν P^{72} : μυριασιν αγιαις αυτου ς C 630 1241 1739 2495 al : αγιαις μυριασιν αυτου A B K L pm : αγιαις μυριασιν αγγελων Ψ pc : μυριασιν αγιων αγγελων αυτου 1838 1845 1846 : αγιαις μυριασιν 1852

15 των (om 1852 1874) εργων (1874 add της) ασεβειας (ℵ C 424** 1241 1739 pc om) αυτων (ℵ 424** 1241 1739 pc om) ησεβησαν και περι παντων ς ℵ A B C K L P pm : om P^{72}

(o) 16a κατα τας επιθυμιας εαυτων C L P 1 209 547 1175 1241 1739 pm : κατα τας επιθυμιας εαυτω P^{72c} : om P^{72*} : κατα τας επιθυμιας αυτων ς rell : κατα τας εαυτων επιθυμιας 38 255

(o) 16b πορευομενοι ς rell : πορεομενοι P^{72c} : om P^{72*}

16c το στομα ς rell : στομα P^{72} : τα στοματα 920

(o) 19 αποδιοριζοντες ς rell : αποδιωριζο̄/τες (= αποδιωριζοντες) P^{72}

Jude

(o) 20a αγιωτατη ς rell (A αγιοτατη) : αγιοτητι P^{72}

20b τη αγιωτατη υμων (ημων C 1 424** 1175 1739 pc, om 460 pc) ς rell : τη εαυτων αγιοτητι P^{72}

20c εποικοδομουντες ς rell : ανυκοδομεισθαι P^{72}

20d εαυτους ς rell : om P^{72}

21a εαυτους ς rell : εαυτοις K 1 242 pc : εαυτοις εαυτους P^{72}

21b ημων ιησου χριστου ante εις ζωην ς rell : ημων $\overline{\text{ιηυ}}$ (= ιησου) $\overline{\text{χρυ}}$ (= χριστου) ante αιωνιον P^{72}

(o) 21c ζωην ς rell : ζοην P^{72}

22 και ς rell : om P^{72} $\text{cop}^{\text{bo ms}}$

22-23 ους μεν ελεγχετε διακρινομενους ους δε σωζετε εκ πυρος αρπαζοντες ους δε ελεειτε (vel ελεατε) εν φοβω A 33 81 323 424** 1739 1881 al : ους μεν ελεατε διακρινομενους ους δε σωζετε εκ πυρος αρπαζοντες ους δε ελεατε εν φοβω $\aleph^{c}$ ($\aleph$* αρπαζετε) Ψ : ους μεν ελεατε διακρινομενους σωζετε εκ πυρος αρπαζοντες ους δε ελεατε εν φοβω B : ους μεν ελεατε (C^{2}, C* ελεγχετε) διακρινομενους ους δε σωζετε εκ πυρος αρπαζοντες εν φοβω C : ους μεν ελεειτε διακρινομενοι ους δε εν φοβω σωζετε εκ πυρος αρπαζοντες K L P 049 056 0142 pm : ους μεν εκ πυρος αρπασατε διακρινομενους δε ελεειτε εν φοβω P^{72} (αρπαζετε et ελεατε it^{t} syr^{ph} cop^{sa} Cl^{lat} Orsisius Hier [om εν φοβω])

Jude

(n) 23 εσπιλωμενον ς rell : εσπειλωμενοι P^{72}

24a φυλαξαι ς rell : στηριξαι P^{72} (623
στηριξαι pro στησαι)

24b υμας (ℵ B C L Ψ al, 1739 pc pon ante φυλαξαι :
ημας A pc : αυτους ς rell, 1829 pon ante
φυλαξαι, 337 1738 pon post απταιστους : om 4*)
απταιστους και ς rell : om P^{72}

24c στησαι ς rell : om P^{72} : στηριξαι 623

24d κατενωπιον ς rell : απεναντι P^{72} :
ενωπιον C 101 2298 pc : κατεναντι 88 915

24e κατενωπιον (vel ενωπιον vel κατεναντι) της
δοξης αυτου ante αμωμους ς rell : απεναντι
της δοξης αυτου ante εν P^{72}

24f αμωμους ς rell : αμωμους αγνευομενους P^{72} :
αμεμπτους A : αμωμους ασπιλους 88 915

** 25a σωτηρι ς rell : om P^{72} 442^{c}

25b ημων pri ς rell (1837 pon ημων και ante
σωτηρι) : ημων αυτω δοξα κρατος τιμη P^{72}

25c δοξα ς ℵ^{c} rell : αυτω δοξα P^{72} : ω δοξα
ℵ* cop^{bo}

25d κρατος και (om 1518) εξουσια ς rell : om P^{72}

25e παντας τους αιωνας ς rell : τους παντας
εωνας P^{72} : τους αιωνας παντας 1837 :
τους αιωνας ℵ pc cop$^{bo^{ms}}$

1 Peter

1:1 καππαδοκιας ς rell (ℵ -κειας) : καπαδοκειας P^{72}

1:3a το πολυ ς rell : πολυ P^{72}

1:3b ημας ς rell : om P^{72} : υμας 314 328* 1241

1:3c ελπιδα ς rell : ελπιδαν P^{72}

1:5 θεου ς rell : om P^{72}

1:6a εν (om C^{2} 1175 1739) ω (om C^{2}) αγαλλιασθε ς rell : αγαλλειασαντες P^{72}

1:6b ποικιλοις ς rell (C -λαις) : πολλοις P^{72}

** 1:7 υμων της πιστεως ς pm : της πειστεως υμων P^{72} 048^{vid} 1241 $it^{l,s}$ vg^{mss} Cl Beda

(o) 1:8a ορωντες ς rell : ορωστες P^{72}

(o) 1:8b ανεκλαλητω ς rell : ανεγλαλητ[ω] P^{72}

(o) 1:11a εραυνωντες ℵ B* 1175 : εραυνωτες P^{72} : ερευνωντες ς A B^{3} K L P pm : ηρευνωντες Ψ

(o) 1:11b ταυτα ς rell : ταυτας P^{72}

** 1:12a ουχ εαυτοις ς pm : ουκ εαυτοις P^{72} 181 1898

1:12b υμας ς rell : υμειν P^{72}

1:14 εν τη αγνοια (ανοια 1175) υμων ς rell : αγνοια υμων P^{72} : εν αγνοια υμων 81 1243 pc : om plane 1241

(o) 1:15 παση ς rell : πασει P^{72}

1:17a επικαλεισθε ς rell : καλειτε P^{72c} : κακλειτε P^{72*} : αιτεισθε 322 323

1 Peter

(o) 1:17b απροσωπολημπτως ℵ A B C : απροσωπολημτως P^{72} : απροσωποληπτως ς rell

1:17c εν φοβω ς rell (ενφοβως 1175) : εν φοβω ουν P^{72}

(n) 1:18 φθαρτοις ς ℵ^{c} rell : φαρτοις P^{72} : φθαρτου ℵ*

(o) 1:20a προεγνωσμενου ς ℵ^{c} C^{2} rell (ανεγ- ℵ*, προσεγ- C*) : προεγνωσαμενου P^{72}

1:20b εσχατων των χρονων ς rell : εσχατων χρονω̄ (= χρονων) P^{72} : εσχατου των χρονων ℵ^{c} A B C 33 81 1241 1739 al : εσχατου του χρονου ℵ* Ψ : εσχατων (εσχατου 1175) των (om 1838) ημερων 69 1175 1838 pc

** 1:21 ελπιδα ς rell : την ελπιδα P^{72} 1243

1:22 εκτενως ς rell : εκτενως ως P^{72}

1:23 εκ ς rell : om P^{72}

1:24a διοτι ς rell : οτι P^{72} : διο Ψ 1852

1:24b χορτου ς rell : om P^{72}

1:25 ευαγγελισθεν εις (εφ 1845) υμας ς rell : εις υμας ευαγγελεισθεν P^{72} it^{1} vg^{mss}

2:1 παντα ς rell : παν P^{72}

(o) 2:2 εις σωτηριαν ℵ A B C K P Ψ 33 69 81 1241 1739 al : ει σωτηρια[ν] P^{72} : om ς rell

1 Peter

2:3 οτι ς rell : επειστευσατε οτι P^{72} :
και ειδετε οτι 337 syr^{p} : om 915

(o) 2:4 εκλεκτον ς rell : εκγλεκτον P^{72}

(o) 2:5a ανενεγκαι ς $\aleph^{c}$ rell : ανενεκκαι P^{72} :
ανενεγκας ℵ* 378 : ενεγκαι 33

2:5b πνευματικας θυσιας ς rell : $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$τικας
(= πνευματικας) P^{72} : θυσιας πνευματικας
33 242 1881 al : θυσιας ℵ

(o) 2:6a εκλεκτον ς rell : εγλεκτον P^{72} : om 181

(o) 2:6b καταισχυνθη ς rell : κατεσχυθη P^{72}

(o) 2:8 προσκομματος ς rell : προσκοματος P^{72}

(o) 2:9a εκλεκτον ς rell : εγλεκτον P^{72}

(o) 2:9b εξαγγειλητε ς rell : εξανγειλητε P^{72} :
εξαγγελητε 242 1837 : εξαγγελλετε 88 915 pc

2:9c αυτου ς rell : om P^{72} $cop^{bo^{ms}}$

** 2:12a εχοντες καλην ς pm : καλην εχοντες P^{72} 218
917 1873 arm Cl Polycarp

2:12b δοξασωσιν ς $\aleph^{c}$ rell : δοξασωσιν υμων P^{72} :
δοξας ου τρεμουσιν ℵ*

(n) 2:13 ανθρωπινη ς $\aleph^{c}$ rell : ανθρωπειν P^{72} : om ℵ*

2:15 αγνωσιαν ς rell : αγνοιαν P^{72} :
εργασιαν 460 1241 pc

(o) 2:16 αλλ ως ς rell : αλλα ως P^{72} : ως 460

1 Peter

	2:17	τον θεον ς rell : τον δε θ̅ν̅ (= θεον) P^{72} Spec : και τον θεον 1319
**	2:19	θεου ς pm : αγαθη̅ (= αγαθην) θ̅υ̅ (= θεου) P^{72} 81
(o)	2:20a	αμαρτανοντες ς rell : αμαρταννοντες P^{72}
**	2:20b	και pri ς rell : om P^{72} 1241
	2:21	υπολιμπανων ς rell : απολειμπανων P^{72c} : αποσειμπανων P^{72*} : υπολαμβανων P
(o)	2:23a	ηπειλει ς rell : ηπηλει P^{72}
**	2:23b	δε ς rell (τε C) : om P^{72} 049* 614 $cop^{sa^{ms},bo^{ms}}$
(o)	2:24a	ανηνεγκεν ς rell : ανηνεκκεν P^{72} : ηνεγκεν 1518
	2:24b	απογενομενοι ς rell : απογεινομενοι P^{72}
(o)	3:3	ιματιων ς rell : ηματιων P^{72}
(o)	3:5	υποτασσομεναι ς rell : υποτασομενε P^{72}
	3:6a	τω (τον 5 460 1891) αβρααμ post υπηκουσεν (vel υπηκουεν) ς rell : τω αβρ̅α̅α̅μ post σαρ̅ρ̅α̅ P^{72}
	3:6b	υπηκουσεν ς rell : υπεκουσεν P^{72} : υπηκουεν B Ψ 69^{vid}
(o)	3:6c	αγαθοποιουσαι ς rell : αγαθαποιουσαι P^{72}
	3:7a	απονεμοντες (αποτεμ- 522, add την 920) τιμην ς rell : τιμην απονεμοντες P^{72}

1 Peter

(o)	3:7b	ζωης ς rell : ζοης P^{72} : ζωσης 242 326 al : om C^2
	3:7c	ζωης ς rell : ζοης εωνιου P^{72} syr^{p} : ζωσης 242 326 al : om C^2
(o)	3:8	ευσπλαγχνοι ς rell : ευσπλανχνοι P^{72}
(o)	3:10a	ζωην ς rell : ζοην P^{72}
(n)	3:10b	παυσατω ς rell : παυσασθαι P^{72} : παυσασθω 216 440 : παυσον 915
(o)	3:10c	την ς rell : τη P^{72}
(o)	3:10d	γλωσσαν ς rell : γλωσαν P^{72}
	3:10e	λαλησαι ς rell : λαλειν P^{72}
(o)	3:13	κακωσων ς rell : κακοσων P^{72}
(o)	3:15	καρδιαις ς rell : καρδιαι P^{72}
	3:16	καταισχυνθωσιν ς rell : εσχυνθωσιν P^{72}
**	3:18a	χριστος ς rell : ο $\overline{\text{χρς}}$ (= χριστος) P^{72} 242
	3:18b	πνευματι ℵ A B C K L P Ψ 1739 rell : εν $\overline{\text{πνι}}$ (= πνευματι) P^{72} Or^{lat} : τω πνευματι ς 33 81^{vid} : πνευμασι 436
(o)	3:20a	κιβωτου ς rell : κηβωτου P^{72}
**	3:20b	τουτ ς rell : τουτο P^{72} 69
(n)	3:20c	οκτω ψυχαι ς rell (88 om τουτ εστιν οκτω, 915 pon τουτ εστιν οκτω post υδατος) : ψυχαι P^{72} : ψυχαι οκτω 255

1 Peter

(n)	3:22	ος ς rell : ου P^{72}
(n)	4:2	βιωσαι ς rell : σωσαι P^{72}
(o)	4:3	οινοφλυγιαις ς rell : οινοφρυκειαις P^{72} : οινοφρυγιαις ℵ* : οινοφλυγιοις B* Ψ
	4:5a	λογον ς rell : om P^{72}
**	4:5b	ετοιμως εχοντι χριναι ς pm : ετοιμω κρινε P^{72} 945 1241 1739 1881 pc
(o)	4:6	κατα ανθρωπους (ανθρωπον 056 326 pc) ς rell : κατ ανθρωπους P^{72}
**	4:8	εαυτους ς pm : αυτους P^{72} 5 255 623 2464
(o)	4:9	γογγυσμου ℵ A B Ψ 1739 al : γογυζμου P^{72} : γογγυσμων ς rell
(o)	4:11a	ινα εν ς rell : ειν εν P^{72}
	4:11b	η ς rell : om P^{72}
	4:11c	το ς rell : om P^{72}
(o)	4:12	υμιν tert ς rell : υμεν P^{72}
**	4:15a	κλεπτης ς rell : ως κλεπτης P^{72c} 69 cop^{bo} : ω κλεπτης P^{72*}
	4:15b	η κακοποιος ς rell : η ως κακοποιος P^{72} : η κακουργος 614 1175 1739 pc : om K
	4:15c	αλλοτριοεπισκοπος ς K L P pm : αλλοτριος (-ιως 181) επισκοπος A Ψ 69 181 1838 : αλλοτριεπισκοπος ℵ B 33 81 pc : αλλοτριοις επεισκοπος P^{72}

1 Peter

4:16 ως ς rell : om P^{72}

4:18 ει ο ς rell : ει ο μεν P^{72} it^{h} vg^{s}

5:1a χριστου ς rell : θ̅υ̅ (= θεου) P^{72}

5:1b της ante μελλουσης ς rell :
της ante δοξης P^{72}

(o) 5:1c αποκαλυπτεσθαι ς rell : αποκαλυπτεστε P^{72}

(o) 5:2 αναγκαστως ς rell : ανακκαστως P^{72}

(o) 5:5 εγκομβωσασθε ς rell : ενκομβωασασθε ℵ :
ενκομβωασσαθε P^{72} : εγκολπισασθε 94 425 :
εγκολπωσασθε 1518 1898 pc : κομβωσασθε 81

(o) 5:6 θεου ς rell : θυ P^{72}

5:7 επιρριψαντες ς B^{3} rell : επιριψαντες ℵ A B*
38 81 1175 : απορειψαντες P^{72} :
επιρριψατε 0206^{vid} 917 pc

(o) 5:8 ωρυομενος ς rell : ορυομενος P^{72}

5:9a ω ς rell : om P^{72}

5:9b στερεοι ς rell : εδρεοι P^{72}

** 5:9c ειδοτες ς rell : ειδοτες οτι P^{72} 206 429
614 1611 2495 pc

** 5:9d επιτελεισθαι ς pm : επειτελειται P^{72} pc (1758 ?)

5:10a αιωνιον ς rell : εωνιαν P^{72}

** 5:10b σθενωσει vel σθενωσαι ς rell : om P^{72} 81
1175 $it^{q,t}$ vg^{mss}

1 Peter

5:10c θεμελιωσει ℵ K L P 1739 rell : θεμελιωση P^{72} : θεμελιωσαι ς 242 (-σοι) 378 614 2495 al : om A B Ψ 0206^{vid} pc

5:12 δι ολιγων ς rell : δια βραχεων P^{72}

5:14 ειρηνη υμιν (add συν 88 915) πασιν τοις εν χριστω ιησου (om A B Ψ 33^{vid} pc) αμην (om A B Ψ 33^{vid} 81^{vid} 1241 1739* pc) ς rell : om P^{72}

2 Peter

(o) 1:2a επιγνωσει ς rell : επειγνωση P^{72}

1:2b του θεου και ιησου ς ℵ A B C K L 1739 pm : του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ (= θεου) $\overline{\iota\eta\upsilon}$ (= ιησου) P^{72} : om P Ψ 1852 2464 pc

(o) 1:3 ζωην ς rell : ζοην P^{72}

1:4a τιμια ημιν και μεγιστα επαγγελματα (add ημιν 101) ℵ K L pm : τιμια και μεγιστα ημιν επαγγελματα B 1 429 614 2495 pc : τειμεια και μεγειστα επαγγελματα ημιν P^{72} : μεγιστα και τιμια ημιν (υμων Ψ, υμιν A pc) επαγγελματα A C P Ψ 33 69 81 1739 al : μεγιστα ημιν και τιμια επαγγελματα ς

2 Peter

	1:4b	της et εν επιθυμια φθορας ς A B K L 0209 pm : την et επιθυμιαν φθορας ℵ cop Hier : την et επειθυμιαν φθοραν P^{72} : της et επιθυμιας (om P) και (33 pc om) φθορας C P Ψ 630 1241 1739 2495 al
(o)	1:5	σπουδην ς rell : σποδην P^{72}
(o)	1:6	γνωσει ς rell : γνωση P^{72}
	1:8	του κ̅υ̅ (= κυριου) $P^{72c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : κ̅υ̅ (= κυριου) P^{72*}
(n)	1:9	μυωπαζων ς rell (μυοπ- P) : μυατιζων P^{72} : μυωταζων 1518
**	1:12a	διο ουκ αμελησω ς pm : δι ου μελλησω P^{72} Ψ pc
(n)	1:12b	καιπερ ς rell : και καιπερ P^{72}
(n)	1:12c	ειδοτας ς rell : ει ειδοτας P^{72}
	1:14	του ς rell : τουτου P^{72}
**	1:15a	και ς rell : om P^{72} 206 1505 2495 pc $it^{w(32)}$ vg^{mss} cop^{bo} (et om Griesbach "ex errore typographi" [Tischendorf])
(o)	1:15b	εκαστοτε ς rell : εκαστοντε P^{72}
	1:20	προφητεια γραφης ς rell : προφητια και γραφη P^{72} : γραφη προφητειας 206 429 522 614 630 1505 2495 al
**	1:21a	ηνεχθη ς rell : ηνεχθη η P^{72} 1852 2298 cop^{sa}
(n)	1:21b	υπο ς rell : υτο P^{72}
	2:6a	γομορρας ς rell (-ρρων 623 915) : γομορας P^{72}

2 Peter

2:6b υποδειγμα ς rell : εις το διγμα P^{72c} :
το διγμα P^{72*}

(o) 2:7 ασελγεια ς rell (-γη 1838) : ασσελγια P^{72}

(n) 2:8 εβασανιζεν ς rell : εβασασανιζεν P^{72}

(o) 2:10a μαλιστα ς rell : μαλλιστα P^{72}

2:10b μιασμου ς rell : σαρκος P^{72} : μιασμον 69 :
μιασματος 467 : μολυσμου P : πειρασμου 385

(o) 2:10c αυθαδεις ς rell : αυδαζεις P^{72}

(o) 2:10d δοξας ς rell : δοξης P^{72}

2:11a ισχυι ς rell : om P^{72} vg^{ms}

2:11b δυναμει ς rell : δυναμεις P^{72} vg^{ms}

2:12a γεγενημενα vel γεγεννημενα ς rell (γενημενα
69) : om P^{72}

(n) 2:12b και φθαρησονται ℵ* A B C* P Ψ 33^{vid} 81 323
945 1241 1739 pc : και και φθαρησονται P^{72} :
καταφθαρησονται ς ℵ^{c} C^{2} K L pm

(o) 2:13a ηδονην ς rell : ηδονη P^{72}

(o) 2:13b τρυφην ς rell : τρυφης P^{72} : τροφην K

(o) 2:13c εντρυφωντες ς rell : εντρυφουντες P^{72}

(n) 2:14 μεστους ς rell : om P^{72}

2:15 βαλααμ ς rell : βαλλααμ P^{72} : βαλαμ P :
βααλ 69 102 : βαλαακ 255

** 2:17 ο ζοφος ς rell : ζοφος P^{72} 522

2 Peter

(o)	2:18	ασελγειαις ς rell : ασσελγειαις P^{72} : ασελγειας P Ψ 81 614 1175 1241 1739 2495 al
(o)	2:20	εμπλακεντες ς rell : ενπλακεντες P^{72} : εμπλαγεντες 623
	2:21	επεγνωκεναι ς rell : εγνωκενε P^{72} Hier Did
(o)	2:22	αληθους ς rell : αληθου P^{72} : om 489 927 1873
(o)	3:3	ημερων εμπαιγμονη C P 0156^{vid} 323 945 1175 1739 al : ημερων ενπεγμονη P^{72} : ημερων εμπαιγμονης 614 1611 pc : ημερων εν εμπαιγμονη ℵ A B Ψ 81 181 1241 al : ημερων ς rell
**	3:7a	και η γη ς rell (om 945) : και γη P^{72} 630
	3:7b	των ς rell : om P^{72}
(n)	3:9	βουλομενος P$^{72c(man 2)}$ ς rell : βουμενος P^{72*}
	3:10	ευρεθησεται ℵ B K P 0156^{vid} 322 323 424** 1175 1739* 1852 1881 : ευρεθησεται λυομενα P^{72} : κατακαησεται ς A L 048 pm : αφανισθησονται C
	3:11	παντων ς rell : παντως P^{72} : απαντων P 323 1175 pc : om 242 1243 pc
(o)	3:14	σπουδασατε ς rell : σπουδασεται P^{72}
	3:16	αυτων ς rell : εαυτων P^{72}
(o)	3:17a	φυλασσεσθε ς rell : φυλασεσθαι P^{72}
(o)	3:17b	πλανη ς rell : πλανης P^{72}
(o)	3:18	γνωσει ς rell : γνωση P^{72} : πιστει P 69 1175

The total number of singular readings here is 184, of which 70 are orthographic singulars and 16 are nonsense singulars. Thus, 98 significant singulars remain, amounting to barely half (53.3%) of the total.

Orthography.--The 70 orthographic singulars constitute 38.0% of the total number of singulars, by far the highest percentage among our six papyri. Since many other orthographic variations were not included,[27] it is clear that the scribe of P^{72} presents a text with very irregular spelling.[28]

In fact, it has been pointed out that the scribe seems to have been influenced by Coptic sound patterns at a number of places.[29] Furthermore, P^{72} is part of a collection of manuscripts which includes several works preserved in Coptic.[30] Finally, in the margin to 2 Pe 2:22 the scribe has glossed the word αληϑου (for αληϑους) with the Coptic word ΠΜΕΪ.[31] The papyrus thus seems firmly located within the range of Coptic influence, and this influence is evidently responsible for many of the orthographic singulars. Indeed, Testuz reports Kasser's opinion that the sound errors can be localized to the region around Thebes.[32] Kilpatrick is more cautious in his use of this evidence,[33] but brings together three pieces of evidence which, as he says, "point to the southern half of Egypt and within this area to a locality between Panopolis and Thebes."[34]

The 70 orthographic singulars may be classified as follows:

Eleven readings arise from the confusion of single and double consonants:[35]

σ for σσ:[36] Jd 13; 1 Pe 2:2,[37] 3:5, 3:10d; 2 Pe 3:17a.

μ for μμ:[38] Jd 4a; 1 Pe 2:8.

σσ for σ:[39] 2 Pe 2:7, 2:18 (ασσελγεια bis).

νν for ν:[40] 1 Pe 2:20a.

λλ for λ:[41] 2 Pe 2:10a.

Thirteen readings arise from various consonant interchanges:

εγ for εκ before γ:[42] Jd 5c.

εγλ for εκλ:[43] 1 Pe 1:8b, 2:6a, 2:9a.

κκ for γκ:[44] 1 Pe 2:5a, 2:24a, 5:2.

ενπ for εμπ:[45] 2 Pe 2:20, 3:3.

ν for γ before a velar stop:[46] 1 Pe 2:9b (νγ), 3:8 (νχ).

εκγλ for εκλ:[47] 1 Pe 2:4.

τ for ϑ:[48] 1 Pe 5:1c.

There is also the spelling βασφημουσιν (for βλ-) at Jd 8b, an omission of a liquid.[49]

Five readings arise from the omission of ν:

Omit -ν before a consonant:[50] Jd 16a; 1 Pe 3:10c.

Omit -ν before a vowel:[51] 2 Pe 2:13a.

Omit medial ν before τ:[52] 1 Pe 1:11a.

Omit medial ν before ϑ:[53] 1 Pe 2:6b.

On the other hand, at 2 Pe 1:15b medial ν is added before τ.[54]

Final -ς is added twice: 1 Pe 1:11b (before δ)[55] and 2 Pe 3:17b (before σ).[56] Medial σ is added one time: Jd 7c (before κ).[57]

On the other hand, final -ς is omitted twice: 1 Pe 3:15 (before υ)[58] and 2 Pe 2:22 (before π).[59]

There is also one example of the shift from final -ν to final -ς:[60] 2 Pe 2:13b. And there is an example of the rare shift from medial ν to medial σ:[61] 1 Pe 1:8a.

At 1 Pe 1:17b P^{72} omits the third π in απροσωποληπτως.[62]

And there are four readings which involve more than one interchange of consonants: 1 Pe 4:3 (ρ for λ and κ for γ),[63] 1 Pe 4:9 (γ for γγ and ζ for σ),[64] 1 Pe 5:5 (ενκ- for εγκ- and σσ for σ),[65] and 2 Pe 2:10c (δ for ϑ and ζ for δ).[66]

There are twenty-one readings which arise from vowel confusions:

ο for ω:[67] Jd 21c; 1 Pe 3:7b, 3:10a, 3:13, 5:8; 2 Pe 1:3.

ω for ο:[68] Jd 19.

ο for ου:[69] 2 Pe 1:5.

ου for ω:[70] 2 Pe 2:13c.

α for ο:[71] 1 Pe 3:6c.

ε for α:[72] 2 Pe 3:14.

η for α:[73] 2 Pe 2:10d.

η for ει:[74] 1 Pe 2:23a; 2 Pe 1:2a, 1:6, 3:18.

ει for η:[75] 1 Pe 1:15.

η for ι:[76] 1 Pe 3:3, 3:20a.

ε for ι:[77] 1 Pe 4:12.

ε for ευ:[78] Jd 16b.

And at Jd 20a the reading αγιοτητι for αγιωτατη involves three sound shifts (ο for ω, η for α, and ι for η).[79] Finally, at 1 Pe 1:20a we have an example of the insertion of α between consonants,[80] perhaps here due to some confusion with the aorist participle.

We may note that our scribe consistently writes ζοη at its four occurrences in these books (Jd 21c; 1 Pe 3:7b, 3:10a; 2 Pe 1:3), and also consistently writes γνωση or επιγνωση at the three places these words occur in the dative (2 Pe 1:2a, 1:6, 3:18).

There are two cases of singular elision[81] (1 Pe 4:6 and 4:11a [where ειν εν = ιν εν]), and one case of singular non-elision[82] (1 Pe 2:16 αλλα ως).

As the final example of an orthographic singular we consider 1 Pe 5:6, where the scribe has neglected to place the line over θυ.[83] Although this is the only place where the line is omitted, the scribe frequently places a superfluous line over various nomina sacra which are written *plene*.[84] By the way, the scribe of P^{75} makes a similar error of omission by writing εστρωσαν (without the line) for εσταυρωσαν at Lk 23:33.

Nonsense Readings.--When we turn to an examination of the nonsense readings in P^{72}, we find confirmation of the carelessness of the scribe. Sixteen readings (8.7% of the singulars) are nonsense, although in most cases there is only the confusion of a letter or two. However, instead of being the result of various sound confusions, these readings are more serious errors resulting, in at least some cases, from visual confusion, internal leaps, or the influence of the context.

Six readings (3.3% of the total) are strictly nonsense: 1 Pe 1:18 (omission of ϑ), 2:13 (omission of η); 2 Pe 1:9 (perhaps the shift from the unusual μυωπαζων to the unknown μυατιζων could have arisen from misreading ωΠΑ as ΑΤΙ), 1:21b (here Π was misread as ΤΙ), 2:8 (an internal dittography occasioned perhaps by the backward leap εβασανιζεν), and 3:9 (here a syllable was omitted, perhaps because of a forward leap βουλομενος based on the similarity of sounds).

The 10 nonsense in context readings (5.4% of the total) may be classified as follows. In 2 cases we have a different but similar looking or sounding word: Jd 7b and 1 Pe 4:2.[85] In 1 case a participle is shifted from singular accusative to plural nominative: Jd 23.[86] In 3 cases a dittography has produced an extra word: 2 Pe 1:12b, 1:12c, 2:12b. On the other hand, in 2 cases an entire word has been omitted: 1 Pe 3:20c; 2 Pe 2:14. In another case one letter was replaced: 1 Pe 3:22.[87] And in the remaining case we have a shift to a verb form which cannot be construed in context: 1 Pe 3:10b.[88]

Incidentally, the participle introduced at 1 Pe 1:6a, although perhaps not quite nonsense in context, is very difficult to construe, and is probably also due to the scribe's attempting an improvement (to agree with the following λυπηθεντες), but doing so badly.[89]

The scribe of P^{72} can also be seen to have increased the rate of production of nonsense as he went farther with his copying. We saw such an increase in the copying of P^{45}, also, and despite the fact that there was a gap between the copying of Jd and the copying of the letters of Peter, the scribe of P^{72} rather clearly makes more blunders as he approaches the end of his task.[90]

In any case, the significant percentage of nonsense readings in P^{72} and the very large percentage of singulars

UMI

resulting from non-standard spelling show that the scribe of P^{72} was extraordinarily careless.[91]

Corrections.--There are 52 corrections to the papyrus, only 2 of which appear to be by a hand other than the scribe's: 2 Pe 1:8,[92] 3:9.[93] In almost all the 50 examples of correction by the scribe, the original reading was an obvious blunder or misspelling, and the scribe has clearly just emended the result of his carelessness. At only 2 places does the original reading have significant support:

Jd 12b	παραφερομενοι	P^{72*} B Ψ 1846 1852 pc :
	παραφερομεναι	P^{72c} ℵ A C K L pm
2 Pe 3:11	om υμας	P^{72*} P^{74} B 1175 vg^{ms} Spec :
	υμας	P^{72c} ς ℵ^{c} A C K L P Ψ 048^{vid} pm

One might imagine that correction to a second exemplar has taken place here, but in fact both errors are natural enough (παραφερομενοι influenced by ανυδροι, simple omission of υμας) that the scribe could well just have corrected a mere blunder. In any case, the scribal correction was not systematic enough to remove the many orthographic singulars[94] and nonsense singulars which remain.

It appears that most of these corrections were made immediately by the scribe, but there is one case where the scribe returned to add in the lower margin a phrase which had been omitted: Jd 16. The original omission could have been by homoeoteleuton: μεμψιμοιροι κατα τας επιϑυμιας εαυτων πορευομενοι και κτλ. And it is curious that the scribe makes two minor errors in his correction (Jd 16a, 16b). There are four other examples of the scribe's corrections being singular readings themselves: Jd 4b; 1 Pe 1:17a, 2:21; 2 Pe 2:6b. In the first example (Jd 4b) we apparently have an incomplete correction: the scribe erased the incorrect νομον (written by metathesis) but then failed to insert the correct μονον.[95] Such an example confirms that the scribe's carelessness extended even to his correcting.

Additions.--Of the 98 significant singulars 16 (16.3%) are additions. Two of these are dittographies, and we have already seen that our scribe tends to repeat portions of his text.[96] The 16 additions are: Jd 4c, 21a, 24f, 25b, 25c; 1 Pe 1:17c, 1:22 (a dittography), 2:3, 2:12b, 2:17, 3:7c, 3:18b, 4:15b, 4:18; 2 Pe 1:14 (a dittography),[97] 3:10. Except for Jd 25b, where 4 words are added (apparently as a harmonization to Re 5:13), all of these additions are of only one word. Thus, the 16 additions increase the number of words in the text by 19, for an average of 1.2 words per addition.

The reasons for most of these 16 additions are rather easy to delineate. Two of them are dittographies. Two add a conjunction to relieve asyndeton (1 Pe 1:17c, 2:17). One (Jd 25b) seems to be a harmonization to a parallel, and one (1 Pe 3:7c) is a harmonization to general usage. One (1 Pe 2:3) appears to be a gloss which has been inserted into the text.[98] Seven others are harmonizations to the context: Jd 4c, 25c; 1 Pe 2:12b, 3:18b, 4:15b, 4:18; 2 Pe 3:10.

Of the remaining two additions Jd 24f may also be an inserted gloss (αγνευομενους clarifying αμωμους), although the confusion surrounding Jd 24 in P^{72}'s text makes it difficult to be confident of any explanation.[99] In the case of Jd 21a we may well have a conflation, based perhaps on the misunderstood correction of the *Vorlage*.[100] Again, though, this reading might be connected to other errors in the context (such as the omission of εαυτους at 20d).

Omissions.--Twenty-nine of the significant singulars are omissions. As many as 9 of these may have arisen by a scribal leap, although a few of these postulated leaps would be rather unlikely.[101] The 29 omissions are: Jd 4b, 8a (μεν μειενουσιν),[102] 15 (περει παντων ... περει παντων), 16c, 20d, 22, 24b, 24c, 25d;[103] 1 Pe 1:3a, 1:3b (αναγεννσας ημας), 1:5, 1:14, 1:20b (εσχατων των in ς K L P pm), 1:23 (ουκ εκ), 1:24b, 2:5b (πνατικας θυσιας), 2:9c (θαυμαστον αυτου),[104] 4:5a, 4:11b, 4:11c, 4:16,[105] 5:9a, 5:14;[106] 2 Pe 1:2b, 1:8, 2:11a, 2:12a (ζωα γεγεν(ν)ημενα), 3:7b.

These 29 omissions form 29.6% of the significant singulars, and 24 of the omissions are of one word only. 1 Pe 1:14 is of two words, Jd 24b and Jd 25d are of three words, Jd 15 is of eight words, and 1 Pe 5:14 is of from six to eight words. If we follow A B Ψ pc at the latter text in stopping with χριστω as the *Vorlage* of P^{72}, then this omission is of six words. The 29 omissions thus cause the loss of 46 words, for an average loss of 1.6 words per addition. Looking just at the omissions and additions, we see that P^{72} has a net loss of 27 words from his *Vorlage*.

The 24 omissions of one word may be categorized as follows:

Articles (7): Jd 16c; 1 Pe 1:3a, 1:20b, 4:11b, 4:11c; 2 Pe 1:8, 3:7b.

Nouns (5): 1 Pe 1:5, 1:24b, 2:5b, 4:5a; 2 Pe 2:11a.

Pronouns (4): Jd 20d; 1 Pe 1:3b, 2:9c, 5:9a.

Conjunctions and particles (4): Jd 8a, 22; 1 Pe 4:16; 2 Pe 1:2b.

Adjectives (2): Jd 4b; 2 Pe 2:12a.

Verb (1): Jd 24c.

Preposition (1): 1 Pe 1:23.[107]

Transpositions.--Eleven (11.2%) of the significant singulars are transpositions, and perhaps as many as 6 of these 11 may have arisen by a leap followed by a "correction" accomplished by writing the omitted words out of order.[108] The transpositions are: Jd 4d (κυριον ημων), 14 (εν μυριασιν),[109] 20b (which also involves a substitution), 21b (κυριου ... χριστου), 24e (which also involves a substitution), 25e (εις παντας); 1 Pe 1:25 (ευαγγελισθεν εις), 3:6a, 3:7a, 5:1b; 2 Pe 1:4a.[110]

The transpositions are of rather small blocks of text. Three involve only 2 words (Jd 20b, 25e; 1 Pe 3:7a), five involve only 3 words (Jd 4d, 14; 1 Pe 1:25, 3:6a, 5:1b), and two involve 5 words (Jd 21b, 24e), although these last two cases are part of the complex of errors made by the scribe at the end of Jude. In the one remaining case, 2 Pe 1:4a, the *Vorlage* is not clear, although the transposition may be from the B text and thus involve only 2 words.

We therefore see in the additions, omissions, and transpositions that the scribe tends to operate with small portions of text at a time. Many of his errors involve only a letter or two, and most of the others (such as these additions, omissions, and transpositions) involve only a very small number of words. The clearest alternative to this mode of copying remains the scribe of P^{45}.

Harmonizations.--We have already noted a few cases where the singulars of P^{72} appear to have arisen because of the tendency to harmonize. As has been the case with our other papyri, the immediate context has had the greatest influence, but our scribe is in fact subject to a variety of other influences. Perhaps surprisingly for the books copied, there are even six examples of assimilation to remote parallels:

Jd 24a: στηριξαι seems to come from Ro 16:25: τω δε δυναμενω υμας στηριξαι.[111]

Jd 25b: The addition here seems to recall Re 5:13, the only New Testament text to contain each of δοξα, κρατος, and τιμη (albeit in a different order).

1 Pe 5:9b: εδραιοι doubtless comes from Col 1:23.[112]

1 Pe 5:12: δια βραχεων is taken from He 13:22.[113]

2 Pe 1:20: P^{72}'s interesting shift here appears to have been occasioned by 2 Tm 3:16: πασα γραφη κτλ.[114]

2 Pe 2:6b: δειγμα comes from the parallel in Jd 7.

There are also three readings in P^{72} which may be harmonizations to general usage:

Jd 12: The verb συνευωχεομαι occurs only here and at 2 Pe 2:13 in the New Testament. Although συνευχομαι does not occur at all in the New Testament, it does occur in Plato and other writers, and the frequent use of ευχη, ευχομαι, etc., in the New Testament has perhaps facilitated the substitution here. On the other hand, the scribe does write συνευωχουμενοι at 2 Pe 2:13.

Jd 24d: Κατενωπιον occurs only here and at two other places in the New Testament,[115] and the three words which various manuscripts substitute for it are all more common in the New Testament.[116]

1 Pe 3:7c: The scribe has expanded "life" to the common "eternal life."[117]

Fifteen further singulars seem to be harmonizations to the immediate context: Jd 4c (ημων bis in vs. 4), 5a (παντας agrees with ειδοτας),[118] 20b (εαυτων from εαυτους in vs. 21), 25c (αυτω resumes θεω); 1 Pe 1:6a (agrees with λυπηθεντες), 1:12b (υμιν bis in vs. 12),[119] 2:12b (υμων bis in vs. 12),[120] 2:15 (αγνοια in 1 Pe 1:14),[121] 3:18b (εν bis in vs. 16, and in vs. 19), 4:15b (ως bis in vs. 15),[122] 4:18 (the contrast between ο δικαιος and ο ασεβης makes the addition of μεν natural);[123] 2 Pe 1:4b (φθοραν is set in apposition with την επιθυμιαν),[124] 2:10b (σαρκος earlier in vs. 10),[125] 3:10 (λυομενων in vs. 11),[126] 3:11 (παντως after ουτως).

We thus see that the general pattern of these harmonizations is:

		98 sign. singulars	24 harmonizations
15	to context	15.3%	62.5%
6	to parallels	6.1%	25.0%
3	to usage	3.1%	12.5%
24	harmonizations	24.5%	

We therefore find again that harmonization to the context is the most frequent type.

None of these harmonizations is an omission or transposition, and the following table shows the kinds of errors caused by the three types of harmonization:

		Replacement	Addition
15	to context	8(53.3%)	7(46.7%)
6	to parallels	5(83.3%)	1(16.7%)
3	to usage	2(66.7%)	1(33.3%)
24	harmonizations	15(62.5%)	9(37.5%)

A rather high percentage of the harmonizations, consequently, involve an addition, and indeed we recall that almost half (7 of 16) of the singular additions arise by harmonization to context.

Grammatical Changes.--Several of the singular readings involve alterations of this sort. There are three confusions of grammatical forms. At 1 Pe 1:3c P^{72} has ελπιδαν,[127] and at 2 Pe 3:16 it has εαυτων for αυτων.[128] And at 1 Pe 3:6b P^{72} has the aorist υπεκουσεν, where the augmenting of α has produced ε instead of η.[129]

At 1 Pe 5:10a the scribe has treated αιωνιος as an adjective with three endings.[130] 1 Pe 2:1 has παν as the masculine accusative form of πας,[131] unless this is just a slip. And Jd 25e has the article before the form of πας.[132]

Four times a conjunction is added: 1 Pe 1:17c (ουν), 1:22 (ως by dittography), 2:17 (δε), and 4:18 (μεν). Besides the dittography,[133] 1 Pe 1:17c and 2:17 arise in order to avoid asyndeton, and 1 Pe 4:18 appears to be a harmonization to context.

On the other hand, three times a conjunction is omitted:[134] Jd 8a (μεν), Jd 22 (και), and 2 Pe 1:2b (και). The last case has theological implications, but the other two seem to be simply the results of carelessness. At only one reading does P^{72} substitute a conjunction: οτι for διοτι at 1 Pe 1:24a.

There are also a few shifts in verbal forms which suggest no particular pattern. The aorist replaces the present tense at Jd 3, and there is the reverse change at 1 Pe 2:24b[135] and 3:10e. A participle is changed to a finite form at Jd 20c (= ανοικοδομεισθε, as Testuz points out), and a finite form to a participle at 1 Pe 1:6a. The passive is shifted to active (with a loss of prefix) at 1 Pe 1:17a, and at 1 Pe 5:10c we may have a shift from active to subjunctive (if this is not merely an orthographic confusion).

Finally, we may note that the scribe omits prepositional prefixes three times (1 Pe 1:17a,[136] 3:16; 2 Pe 2:21), and changes prefixes three times (Jd 20c; 1 Pe 2:21, 5:7[137]).

Proper Names.--At four readings P^{72} misspells proper names because of minor orthographic confusions. The scribe writes only one ρ in γομορρα at Jd 7a and 2 Pe 2:6a,[138] writes only one π in καππαδοκιας at 1 Pe 1:1,[139] and doubles the λ in βαλααμ at 2 Pe 2:15.[140]

At Jd 11 the scribe has, though, replaced βαλααμ by βαλαακ, obviously confusing the two characters from Nu 22-24. At 2 Pe 2:15 the twelfth-century 255 makes the same error, and, while at the other New Testament occurrence of βαλααμ, Re 2:14, Hoskier cites no variation, several manuscripts make the reverse confusion by writing βαλααμ for βαλακ later in that verse.

Finally, at Jd 9 the scribe writes the anomalous form $\overline{\mu\iota\chi\alpha\eta\varsigma}$ for μιχαηλ; this must be a blunder.

Theological Changes.--There are three singular readings in P^{72} which indicate that the scribe had theological motivations for at least some of his alterations to the text. These are Jd 5b, 1 Pe 5:1a, and 2 Pe 1:2b. King cites these three, and says that they

> give evidence of the fullest acceptance of the deity of Christ by the scribe (or one of his predecessors) and the church in his area.[141]

Of Jd 5b in particular King goes on to remark:

> It is not strictly a conflation since no manuscript reads 'Christ,' yet it does have something of that feeling and certainly represents the highest possible Christology. The three instances take on added significance as we consider that the date was undoubtedly well before the Nicene Council or any activity of Athanasius.[142]

1 Pe 5:1a in P^{72} refers to "the sufferings of God" (των του θ̅υ̅ παθηματων), and Beare claims that this "may reflect an unconscious Patripassianism (the recurrent error of lay theologians who take pride in their orthodoxy)."[143] However, this seems to be an unfair criticism of the scribe's theology, since he does not refer to the sufferings of the Father (surely a prerequisite for Patripassianism), but only to the sufferings of God. The reading would indeed appear to be at the very least compatible with that "highest possible Christology" of which King speaks.

Jd 5 presents a well-known crux, and it does seem that P^{72}'s reading is almost a conflation of the two readings with θεος and κυριος.[144] But the χριστος is not in fact attested, and it is difficult to imagine that P^{72}'s reading could be a mere blunder. We seem to be forced, therefore, to assume that here too the scribe has deliberately introduced a reading in order to ascribe Deity to Christ.[145]

The third reading, 2 Pe 1:2b, results from a mere omission, and one might think that this is simply an accident.[146] But the resulting reading in P^{72}, εν επειγνωση του θυ ιηυ του κυριου ημων, fits so well with the two previously discussed readings that it is natural to suppose that here too we have in effect a Christological statement by the scribe.[147]

Special Cases.--There are a few other readings in P^{72} which pose special problems. We may note, in particular, that Jd 20-25 present a very high density of singulars,[148] so high in fact that King conjectures that the scribe was trying to reproduce the text here from memory.[149] Jd 22-23 is especially confusing, but some scholars have even suggested that P^{72} is correct here.[150] The general carelessness of the scribe, though, and his increased carelessness in this section of Jude make it extremely unlikely that we have here the authentic text.[151] P^{72} does have the shortest reading at Jd 22-23, and so its error would most easily be described as an omission. However, I have not ventured to choose which of the many readings there should be considered the Vorlage of P^{72}.

Finally, at 1 Pe 4:15c the scribe evidently was puzzled by the unusual αλλοτρι(ο)επισκοπος, and made a minor addition in order to create an easier reading.[152]

Summary.--The following are the main features of the copying activity of the scribe of P^{72}.

I. The scribe spells very irregularly, and thus creates a high percentage of readings involving orthographic variations. The scribe also creates a fair number of nonsense readings. In short, the scribe was extremely careless. He has corrected his errors rather frequently, but has missed many others, and indeed creates a few singular readings by his corrections.

II. The scribe has a tendency to omit more often than he adds, but does not often omit more than one word. His transpositions, infrequent in occurrence, also involve rather short blocks of text.

III. The scribe often creates readings by harmonization to context, but also is influenced by remote parallels to an extent unexpected given the books which he is copying.

IV. Alone among our papyri P^{72} gives evidence of some theological purpose in the scribe's creation of singulars: three readings appear to reflect the scribe's belief that Christ was fully God.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Michel Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII-IX* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1959), p. 8.

[2] According to Aland, *Repertorium*, p. 303, and Nestle-Aland, p. 688.

[3] Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 29: "L'écriture des Epîtres de Pierre est la même que celle de la lettre de Jude, c'est le même scribe qui a copié l'un et l'autre ouvrage."

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[5] *Kurzgefasste Liste*, p. 33; *Repertorium*, p. 303; Nestle-Aland, p. 688.

[6] Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 9.

[7] P^{78} (III/IV century) contains only Jd 4-5, 7-8; P^{81} contains only 1 Pe 2:20-3:1, 3:4-12; and 0206 contains only 1 Pe 5:5-13. The only other papyrus to contain any of these three epistles is the much younger (seventh century) and fragmentary P^{74}.

[8] Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 11.

[9] A curious case is Testuz' note to P^{72}'s reading τηρουμενους at 2 Pe 2:4: "ΤΗΡΟΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ avec 9 ms." This is actually the reading of B C* K L P 69 181 206 312 322 323 328 429 442 614 1175 1518 1739 and most of the other manuscripts (Tischendorf says "al fere^{60}"). How did Testuz' error arise? In Nestle-Aland we find τηρουμενους in the text, with the note: ⸀ (9) κολαζομενους τηρειν ℵ A . . . . Testuz evidently interpreted the "(9)" as a reference to the support for the reading in the text, while it actually (of course) is a note that the reading of ℵ A al is a harmonization to vs. 9.

[10] Carlo M. Martini, *Beati Petri Apostoli Epistulae Ex Papyro Bodmeriana VIII Transcriptae* (Milan: Pizzi, 1968), pp. XVII-XVIII.

[11] The following is the complete list, with Testuz' reading first, cited by page and line of the papyrus:

p. 2, l. 1:	ΤΟΥΣ	:	το^{υ}ς
p. 2, l. 17:	ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ	:	πιστεως υμων
p. 5, l. 14:	ΥΜΩΝ	:	υμω^{ν} [[ηγνικοτες]]
p. 12, l. 13:	ΥΠΟΤΑΣΟΜΕΝΕ	:	υωοτασομενε
p. 18, l. 6:	ΠΕΙΡΑΣ[[$\overset{M}{Σ}$]]ΟΝ	:	πειρασ[[$\overset{μ}{ς}$]]ον
p. 20, l. 12:	ΠΑΝΤΕΣ	:	παντ[[ε]]ες
p. 28, l. 15mg:	ΚΑΤΕΠ Ρ]ΗΣΕΝ	:	κ̣ατεπ ρ̣]η̣σεν
p. 30, l. 12mg:	ΚΑΤΑΡΑ	:	καταρας

P. 2, l. 17, is a reconstruction based on the space involved, and Testuz agrees that the space for υμων is there. P. 12, l. 13, is simply a typographical error in Martini's edition; he makes no note on this reading and the facsimile agrees with Testuz. On the other hand, Martini appears from his facsimile to be correct at p. 18,ll. 6, and at the other places except for the placement of dots at p. 28, l. 15mg: there is no doubt about the κ and η in his facsimile. (Martini, *Epistulae*, p. XVII, says: "Un punto sotto la lettera indica che essa non si legge che in parte." But this seems too weak a criterion.)

[12] Édouard Massaux, "Le texte de l'Épître de Jude du Papyrus Bodmer VII (P^{72})," *Scrinium Lovaniense: Mélanges historiques Étienne Van Cauwenbergh*, Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 4^{e} Série, Fascicule 24 (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1961), pp. 108-25; and "Le texte de la I^{a} *Petri* du Papyrus Bodmer VIII (P^{72})," *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*, 39 (1963), pp. 616-71.

[13] See "Jude," p. 109, and "I^{a} *Petri*," pp. 616-17. Massaux cites, though, at Jd 8 P^{72r}s αθετουσι, with the note: "loco αθετουσιν: omnes." (By the way, since the Textus Receptus reads here αθετουσι, it is likely that the editors have just not recorded some actual support for P^{72}.)

[14] "Jude," p. 108; "*I^{a} Petri*," p. 616.

[15] Cf. "Jude," p. 108: "Nous avons soumis le texte de ce papyrus à un examen approfondi . . . ." In "*I^{a} Petri*," p. 671 n. 26, Massaux even comments on Beare's earlier study, saying that Beare "s'est apparemment moins attaché que nous à l'examen des minuscules et est moins complet." As we shall see, though, Massaux' attachment to the minuscules goes only so far as to cite minuscule numbers with fondness, but not to take care to cite the evidence correctly. Indeed, with Beare's study before him, Massaux misses two of the 29 "singular readings" listed by Beare Frank W. Beare, "The Text of I Peter in Papyrus 72," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 80 (1961), pp. 254-55, namely 2:21 and (the rather striking) 5:1a.

[16] Thus, at Jd 12 Massaux ("Jude," p. 115) cites for the omission of οι: K S 42 . . . . Tischendorf's edition merely has "K al longe plu" for this omission, but the correction (*Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 1285) says: "ante K adde $\aleph C^{2}$." But since $\aleph^{c}$ has been cited *for* οι, something has clearly gone wrong. Nestle-Aland cites $\aleph^{*}$ K 049 al for the omission.

A clearer case is 1 Pe 4:14. Massaux ("*I^{a} Petri*," p. 660) follows Tischendorf's apparatus in citing $\aleph^{c}$ 33 al for επαναπεπαυται, which is the reading of P^{72}. However, the correction (*Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 1284) informs us that $\aleph^{c}$ actually reads επαναπεπαυται, while 33 and the other minuscules cited with it have αναπεπαυται. Nestle-Aland confirms this correction.

[17] "Jude," p. 109.

[18] This omission is remarkable since, of course, it is precisely 424** which has the interesting readings, and not 424; cf. Hort, *Introduction*, p. 155.

[19] 935 is von Soden's δ361, which is of the *I*^{b2} text type, and thus would go along with 1739. However, von Soden does not cite δ361 in his introduction (*Text*, p. XVI), and does not include it among the manuscripts for which he had collations for the Catholic Epistles (*Die Schriften, Untersuchungen*, p. 1841).

[20] One may note that 7, 13, 29, and 66 do not even contain the Catholic Epistles.

[21] "*I^{a} Petri*," p. 616 and n. 1.

[22] The following difficulties were noted in a check of our list of singulars of P^{72} in 1 Peter with Massaux' collation in his "*I^{a} Petri*."

1:5 According to von Soden 917 has δυναμει πνευματος θεου, not δυναμει πνευματος.

1:6 Massaux fails to note that P^{72} omits εν ω (with C^{2} only).

1:14 According to von Soden 1175 has εν τη ανοια, not ανοια.

1:20 Massaux takes Tischendorf's "των χρονων ($\aleph^{c}$)" to mean that *only* $\aleph^{c}$ has των χρονων, and then presumes that most manuscripts agree with P^{72}'s χρονων. In fact, P^{72}'s reading (at 1:20b) is singular.

2:5 Massaux has somehow misinterpreted the editions so as to take ς rell as agreeing with P^{72} in omitting θυσιας.

2:6 Massaux fails to note 2:6b.

2:19 P^{72} and 81 agree; Massaux gives the same reading for each, but fails to note the agreement (with a "cum").

3:10 The two weakly attested readings are not noted at 3:10b.

3:10 Massaux fails to note 3:10e.

4:3 Massaux takes P^{72}'s οινοφρυκειαις as supported by $\aleph^{*}$. But the simple confusion of γ and κ is not among the scribal tendencies cited by Massaux on pp. 616-17 (although it is referred to by Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 32).

4:9 Massaux renders the text of P^{72} incorrectly by printing γογυσμου (cf. Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 32), and also credits K L P S etc. with γο$\underline{\gamma}$υσμων.

4:15 Massaux has taken von Soden's indication of Alexandrian support for αλλοτριεπισκοπος (at 4:15c) to include C;

however, C is missing for 1 Pe 4:6 - 2 Pe 1:1, as is noted by von Soden on the card accompanying his edition.

5:14 Massaux saves a spectacular error for last. He cites as having αγαπης ειρηνη υμιν πασιν τοις εν χριστω (without ιησου): ℵ A B C P Ψ 1 5 33 and seven lines of minuscules. C is missing here, and, according to Tischendorf and von Soden, only the following have χριστω alone: A B Ψ 33^{vid} (this is Tischendorf's citation; von Soden has "?," but Massaux just cites "33") 36 218 307 453 610 1838. These are included by Massaux in his list, but dozens of other manuscripts are also included without, as it appears, any justification. (Nestle-Aland has only: A B Ψ 33^{vid} pc.) Finally, Massaux fails to note the variation here involving the presence or absence of αμην.

When we recall that these errors were found simply by checking the singular readings (a small portion of the whole, of course), we see that Massaux' collation is quite unreliable. This verdict is all the more surprising since Massaux offers virtually no evaluation of the readings of P^{72}, and thus intends his work to be judged solely on the accuracy and completeness of his collation.

[23] It is curious that Sakae Kubo (*P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, Studies and Documents, Vol. XXVII [Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965]), who evidently went over the textual evidence in detail, cites Massaux' work with no comment or criticism (see pp. 23-24, 29-30 [notes 13, 14, and 16]).

[24] The discrepancies found between our list of singulars and Kubo's lists are as follows.

From his list (*ibid*., pp. 10-11) of orthographic variants we have considerable divergence. Kubo excludes readings due to certain common variations and characteristics of the scribe (pp. 9-10), but even apart from these his list is incomplete. Within 1 Pe 1 alone Kubo misses 1:8a, 1:11a, 1:15 (perhaps considered to be an itacism), and 1:17b. On the other hand, his list includes some proper names and the following readings which are not singular: 1 Pe 1:14 συνσχη- (= C), 1 Pe 3:8 συνπα- (= C), 1 Pe 3:13 γενεσθε (= [by itacism] γενεσθαι ℵ* 1175), 1 Pe 5:1 συνπρεσ- (= ℵ A), and 2 Pe 1:6 bis ενκρα- (= C bis; Kubo has one of these as 2:6). Also, Kubo misstates the readings at 1 Pe 2:24b, gives as 2 Pe 2:10 what should be 2:6a, and gives as 2 Pe 2:15 what should be 2:10c. Finally, three readings cited at the end (p. 11) appear to be more than merely orthographic: 1 Pe 5:9d (where the reading is not singular anyway); 2 Pe 1:9, 1:21b.

In Kubo's list of "obvious scribal errors" (pp. 11-12), 1 Pe 3:4 is not singular (= A* 241), 2 Pe 3:8 is not singular (= ℵ 467 1241 [note, by the way, that the twenty-fifth edition of Nestle-Aland misstates the reading of P^{72} and ℵ, and fails to note 467 despite the "." indicating that all witnesses have been recorded; the twenty-sixth edition cites P^{72} ℵ 1241 for the actual omission]), and 2 Pe 3:15 should be 3:16, where P^{72}, whose reading Kubo has incorrect, is supported by C* P al. Also, Kubo's first 2 Pe 1:14 should be 1:12 (c), and his 2 Pe 3:6 should be 1 Pe 3:6 (c). At Jd 15 παντας τους ασεβεις is not omitted, as Kubo claims, but is replaced (as in ℵ 1852) by πασαν ψυχην; the omission then begins later. And Kubo's Jd 18 is really the marginal correction to Jd 16 (a). After the list (on p. 12) are cited 1 Pe 4:5b (where P^{72} = 945 pc) and 2 Pe 1:12a (where P^{72} = Ψ pc). Finally, it is unclear why Kubo counts as "obvious" errors the dittographies at 2 Pe 1:12b, 1:12c, 1:14, and 2:12b, but does not include 1 Pe 1:22 here, counting it rather as an addition (p. 15, cited as 1:23).

In Kubo's list of substitutions (p. 13) the Vorlage of 1 Pe 1:6a is surely misstated (without εν ω), Kubo takes Jd 4b-c as a substitution rather than an omission and an addition, and he collapses the variations at Jd 24 and Jd 25 into one for each verse. Also, 2 Pe 1:20 is listed here as a substitution and on p. 15 as an addition; clearly the addition of και and the shift to the nominative γραφη are two parts of one variation.

Kubo's list of omissions (p. 14) does not include Jd 15, since he lists that as an obvious error. On the other hand, he includes 1 Pe 5:10, which is simply a mistake on his part (if he means the υμας after καταρτισει, that is also omitted by ℵ A B al), and also includes 1 Pe 5:11 which should be divided into two variations (P^{72} is supported by A B Ψ pc in the omission of η δοξα και, and is supported by K 049 al in the omission of το; according to the United Bible Societies' edition 0206^{vid} also has both these omissions).

The list of additions (p. 15) has υμων instead of δε at 1 Pe 2:17. At 1 Pe 3:18 there is no τω present in P^{72}, at Jd 20b we have really a substitution and transposition (εαυτων for υμων), and 2 Pe 1:20 is, as noted above, listed here and under substitutions. Also as noted earlier, the dittography at 1 Pe 1:22 is included here, but not four other dittographies.

In the list of transpositions (p. 15), Kubo has given the text of P^{72} incorrectly at 1 Pe 3:6 and Jd 20.

[25] At Jd 4 Testuz prints XPN with no line, although he gives it with a line in his apparatus; I assume that the omission of the line is Testuz' error. However, at 1 Pe 5:6 Testuz says "ΘΥ n'est pas surligné," and Martini says "θυ: caret lineola supra litteras." Thus, this omission is due to the scribe. At 1 Pe 5:9d von Soden reports that 1758 (his $\underline{I}^{bl\ 396}$) has -ειται, although in the previous line of his apparatus he reported επιτελεισθε as being found in, among others, $\underline{I}^{bl\ 365f}$, which are 206 and 1758. But Nestle-Aland cites P^{72} pc, so I exclude P^{72}'s reading here.

At 2 Pe 2:6 both Nestle-Aland and the United Bible Societies' edition cite P^{72} as substituting in the margin κατεπ[ρ]ησεν for κατεκρινεν. However, there is no indication that this marginal word is to be inserted, and it is probably just one of several words in the margin of 1-2 Pe which are designed to clarify the text, but not to be replacements for it. Cf., for instance, the marginal ορασις at 2 Pe 2:8 which is, as Testuz says (*Papyrus*, p. 33), "mis ici pour expliquer l'expression «ΒΛΕΜΜΑΤΙ» du texte." Cf. also the Coptic word ΠΜΕΪ with reference to 2 Pe 2:22 (and Testuz, *ibid*.).

[26] See the table in Kubo, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, p. 27, where P^{72} is most closely related to B, followed by: 1739, C, 33, א, A, 323, 623, and Ψ. In an earlier study Beare, "Text," found that P^{72} agrees in 1 Peter more closely with A and Ψ than with B, א, and C. In any case, the Alexandrian influence is clear. In his "Textual Relationships in Jude," *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 276-82, Kubo finds that P^{72} "can now also be classified here [in the Alexandrian text] but only as a weak member" (p. 280; see the table on p. 281).

[27] Cf. Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 16 and pp. 30-31, for some comments on the itacisms excluded here. For an example of what the scribe can produce, see 1 Pe 3:1: ομοιως ε γυνεκες υποτασσομενε τοις ειδιοις ανδρασειν εινα κτλ.

UMI

[28] Cf. Beare, "Text," p. 254: "the manuscript itself is not the work of a careful scribe," and his stronger judgment in "Some Remarks on the Text of I Peter in the Bodmer Papyrus (P^{72})," _Studia Evangelica_, Vol. III, Part II, ed. F. L. Cross, Texte und Untersuchungen, Vol. 88 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), p. 263:

> "It is the work of a relatively careless scribe, who is guilty of numerous mistakes in spelling. It is evident that he took the text from dictation, and some of his errors appear to be occasioned by his Coptic ear."

Note, though, that since the scribe would doubtless be reading his text aloud as he copied, a "sound" error would be possible even without dictation being involved; see Metzger, _Text_, p. 13 and note 3, and p. 16.

Kubo, _P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus_, p. 17, comments:

> "It can easily be seen from the above [the lists of singular readings] that the scribe was not the best of scribes and cannot in any way be compared to that of Codex Vaticanus."

Kubo's lists of errors in B in 1 Pe, 2 Pe, and Jd (on pp. 17-19) do show--provided that they are generally accurate--that B has only a small percentage of the singular readings which we find in P^{72}. Martini, _Epistulae_, p. XVIII, also compares the errors found in these two manuscripts, and says that the numbers "mostrano la distanza qualitativa che separa il nostro scriba da quello dei grandi unciali del secolo IV."

[29] See Testuz, _Papyrus_, pp. 32-33, and Beare, "Some Remarks," p. 263: "almost certainly written in Egypt by a scribe whose mother tongue was Coptic."

[30] These are conveniently listed by Kilpatrick, "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," pp. 46-47.

[31] Cf. Testuz, _Papyrus_, p. 33 and n. 1.

[32] _Ibid._, p. 32.

[33] "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," p. 34: "The value of this indication [sound confusions] is doubted by other Coptic scholars." I have found no specific reference to what is in dispute here. Incidentally, through a typographical error Kilpatrick refers to the confusion of Δ and P, which should in fact be the confusion of Λ and P (at 1 Pe 4:3, which Testuz refers to at _Papyrus_, p. 32).

[34] "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," p. 34. Kilpatrick is actually being less specific than was Testuz, since Kilpatrick sees the first piece of evidence as perhaps indicating Panopolis, the second piece (the sound confusions) as perhaps indicating Thebes, and the third piece as indicating a provenance somewhere in the south of Egypt. Thus, he makes the less precise localization of somewhere between Panopolis and Thebes. Kubo therefore misunderstands the force of what Kilpatrick is saying when he (Kubo) says: "G. D. Kilpatrick thinks the evidence points more precisely to a locality between Panopolis and Thebes" (*P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, p. 29 n. 5).

[35] Cf. Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 16 and p. 31.

[36] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 158-59.

[37] This could be seen as omission of final -ς; cf. *ibid*., pp. 124-25, where Gignac notes (p. 124) that for omission of final -ς before σ "haplography in continuous writing is a possible alternative interpretation."

[38] *Ibid*., p. 157.

[39] *Ibid*., pp. 159-60.

[40] *Ibid*., p. 158.

[41] *Ibid*., pp. 155-56.

[42] *Ibid*., p. 173.

[43] *Ibid*., p. 175.

[44] *Ibid*., pp. 171-72.

[45] *Ibid*., p. 171.

[46] *Ibid*., pp. 170-71.

[47] Gignac cites εκγλημπτωρ, *ibid*., p. 175.

[48] *Ibid*., p. 87 (after σ).

[49] *Ibid*., p. 107. The scribe made the same error at Jd 10, but corrected himself to the usual reading.

UMI

[50] *Ibid*., pp. 111-12.

[51] *Ibid*., p. 112.

[52] *Ibid*., pp. 116-17.

[53] No example of such omission is cited by Gignac, but the omission of medial nasals appears common enough in general; see *ibid*., pp. 116-17.

[54] *Ibid*., p. 118.

[55] *Ibid*., pp. 125-26.

[56] *Ibid*. This could, of course, just be a dittography.

[57] *Ibid*., p. 131. On p. 130 Gignac gives two examples of the reverse substitution of προ- for προσ-. Note that προσκειμαι would be nonsense in context at Jd 7.

[58] *Ibid*., p. 125.

[59] *Ibid*., pp. 124-25.

[60] *Ibid*., pp. 131-32.

[61] *Ibid*., p. 131 n. 3.

[62] Gignac, *ibid*., p. 64, reports that π is sometimes omitted in "combinative forms of -λημπτ-." It may be noted that at the six places where the similar words προσωπολημπτεω, προσωπολημπτης, and προσωπολημψια occur in the New Testament (Ac 10:34; Ro 2:11; Eph 6:9; Col 3:25; Jas 2:1, 2:9), only a few manuscripts (the oldest) have the μ, and the only reported variation is the presence or absence of this μ. Cf. BDF, §119(2).

[63] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 105-7 and p. 79 (intervocalic shift). ℵ* also makes the first shift (not noted by Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 32).

[64] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 116 (see the example παραγελλεται) and pp. 120-21.

[65] *Ibid*., p. 168 and pp. 159-60. Note that ℵ also makes the first shift.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 96 and p. 76.

[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 275-77. Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 31, cites only 1 Pe 3:7b and 3:13.

[68] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 277. Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 16, cites this reading.

[69] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 212 (unaccented).

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 210 (medial).

[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 287-88 (unaccented).

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

[73] Gignac, *ibid.*, p. 286, refers to this interchange, but gives no example of the shift in this direction.

[74] *Ibid.*, pp. 240-41. Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 31, cites only 2 Pe 1:2a, and says that this interchange occurs "rarement." But four cases in this direction make it fairly common.

[75] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 239 (an example of πασει is cited). Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 31, also cites this reading.

[76] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 237-38 (both examples are unaccented; Gignac cites ηματια, which is a parallel to 1 Pe 3:3). Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 31, cites these two readings, and then says:

> "L'exemple de I pour H est un peu particulier, car pour le mot ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ, le scribe n'a écrit que $\overline{\mathrm{XP\Sigma}}$ (p. 7, l. 2) et il avait probablement compris «Christ»."

Testuz is referring to 1 Pe 2:3, but since he relies on the twenty-third edition of Nestle-Aland, he is unaware that in fact K L al agree with P^{72} in having χριστος here, and indeed Tischendorf cites L 33 69 pc as having $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$. The twenty-sixth edition of Nestle-Aland reports this variant, and such variation is rather common; see Mt 11:30, Lk 6:35, and BDF, §24.

[77] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 253 (before a nasal). The scribe meant to write υμειν, but omitted the ι, as he also did at 1 Pe 2:7, although at the latter text he corrected his error.

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 275-77, p. 286 (see note 73 above), and pp. 235-36 (unaccented in final position). In his apparatus Testuz says: "ΑΓΙΟΤΗΤΙ lire ΑΓΙΩΤΑΤΗ peut-être."

[80] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 311-12.

[81] See BDF, §17; Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 95; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1379-80.

[82] See BDF, §17; Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, pp. 93-94; von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1377-78.

[83] This error is noted by both Testuz and Martini; see note 25 above.

[84] Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 16 and p. 30.

[85] The scribe may have remembered σωζει from 1 Pe 3:21.

[86] Here the scribe takes the word as agreeing with the preceding μισουντες.

[87] The scribe was obviously influenced by the preceding ιησ*ου* χριστ*ου* to write ου.

[88] The form could be meant as either παυσασθαι or παυσασθε (cf. Beare, "Text," p. 254), but neither seems possible here. However, the scribe probably meant παυσασθαι as a parallel to the preceding infinitives αγαπαν and ιδειν.

[89] Beare, "Text," p. 254, notes that this could be "an instance of the imperatival use of the participle." This is possible (see BDF, §468[2]), although I suspect that our scribe has simply blundered.

[90] It happens that the set of singular readings is divided almost precisely by considering Jd, 1 Pe 1-2, 1 Pe 3-5, and 2 Pe. However, the set of nonsense readings is thus divided quite unevenly, as the following

table shows:

	Jd	1 Pe 1-2	1 Pe 3-5	2 Pe
Readings	43	47	48	46
Strictly nonsense	0	2	0	4
Nonsense in context	2	0	4	4
Total nonsense	2	2	4	8
% of readings	23.4	25.5	26.1	25.0
% of nonsense readings	12.5	12.5	25.0	50.0

Perhaps the way to see this shift most clearly is to calculate the percentage of readings in each section which are nonsense; we then obtain:

Jd	4.7%
1 Pe 1-2	4.3%
1 Pe 3-5	8.3%
2 Pe	17.4%

Thus, the scribe of P^{72} creates nonsense almost four times as often in the book he ends with as in the book he begins with.

[91] Martini, *Epistulae*, p. XVIII, comments: "gli *errori* veri e propri dello scriba sono assai numerosi, e dimostrano una diligenza assai mediocre e una conoscenza piuttosto incerta della lingua greca."

[92] Here Testuz notes: "TOY ajouté plus tard, autre main." And Martini notes: "του additum postea, ab alia manu."

[93] Testuz comments: "la syllabe ΛΟ paraît ajoutée par une autre main." And Martini says: "λο supra lineam, et probabiliter ex alia manu additum."

[94] Testuz, Papyrus, p. 32, calls attention to the corrections at 1 Pe 3:9, 2 Pe 1:5, and 2 Pe 1:13 (here too we have a superfluous line along with the final -ν), where the scribe has pointed for omission a κ added before γ. As we have seen, the scribe has frequent difficulty with these two letters, but these three corrections (to which might be added Jd 4b; 1 Pe 1:17a; 2 Pe 3:6) show that the scribe is conscious of correct spelling, and does try to produce a text with normal orthography. Obviously, though, he does not succeed, and indeed seems unconcerned about other "abnormal" spellings (such as ζοη).

[95] In his apparatus Testuz says: "Le scribe a biffé le mot, sans récrire la forme correcte."

[96] Cf. the nonsense dittographies at 2 Pe 1:12b, 1:12c, 2:12b. Four other dittographies have been corrected: Jd 13; 1 Pe 1:22, 3:18b, 5:5b. (And see also the internal dittography at 2 Pe 2:8.) The scribe seems to have had a special tendency to create dittographies at the ends of lines, since seven of the nine (non-internal) dittographies occur in this position (all except Jd 13 and 2 Pe 1:12c). It is, moreover, evident that the scribe was especially careless during his copying of 2 Pe 1:12-14 in order to produce three dittographies so close together.

By the way, Testuz does not note the correction at 1 Pe 1:22, but Martini does and says: "probabiliter ipse scriba elavit verbum spongia et transcripsit in linea sequenti, ut titulum apponeret." This way of putting matters suggests that the scribe simply changed the position of ηγνικοτες in order to coincide with the marginal title (περι αγνια), which appears to the left of the extant occurrence of ηγνικοτες. Such a scenario, though, would seem to require that the title was present before the text, and I suggest that the more likely sequence was that the scribe originally wrote the word twice, and caught his error when he subsequently wrote the title.

[97] The dittography here is, of course, of the article του; however, in order to count this as sensical, we must consider the reading to be the demonstrative τουτου.

[98] Beare, "Text," p. 254, comments on this addition:

> "It would appear that the scribe has not recognized the use of Ps 33 (34) 9, and taking the phrase 'Christ is the Lord' to be a confessional formula, he has added an

interpretative gloss, as if to say, 'In this context, "tasted" means "believed."' Cf. Jerome (*Ezek*. 9 [270C]): si quidem credidistis quia suavis est dominus."

On the other hand, Jerome D. Quinn, "Notes on the Text of the P^{72} 1 Pt 2,3; 5,14; and 5,9," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 27 (1965), p. 243, says that the "interpolation seems to have occurred basically due to grammatical pressure." Quinn remarks that ει is here used unusually, and that οτι is unusual after γευομαι. Quinn cites Edward Gordon Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (2d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1947), who refers to the meaning of ει here (p. 157), and to the fact that γευομαι is followed by οτι only here and in Pr 31:18 LXX (p. 156). Selwyn notes (*ibid*.) that this unusual οτι results from Ps 33:9 (LXX) when και ιδετε is omitted, "the καὶ ἴδετε not being used owing to its not being required by the imagery of the suckled child, or having fallen out in liturgical use." Note that 337 syr^{p} restore και ιδετε by harmonization

Quinn goes on to say: "The scribe of P^{72} or of its archetype found that the reading could be eased simply by recourse to the LXX Ps 33,9 which 1 Pt is here citing" ("Notes," pp. 243-44). But since πιστευω doesn't occur in Ps 33:9, it appears that Beare's description of P^{72}'s addition as an "interpretative gloss" is the correct one.

It is interesting that Ps 33-34 were part of the collection from which P^{72} comes (although written by a different scribe), and one can thus see (Testuz, *Papyrus*, p. 77) that this collection followed the usual LXX reading except for the orthographic variation (*ibid*., p. 74) εδετε for ιδετε (was the scribe thinking of a form of εδομαι as appropriate to follow γευσασθε?).

By the way, the possibility that a gloss, perhaps originally written in the margin, might enter the text is confirmed by what happens to P^{72}'s gloss at 2 Pe 2:6 in recent apparatuses. See note 25 above.

[99] Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*, cites an occurrence of αγνευω within his literature only at Barnabas 19:8.

[100] It seems that P^{72} also has a conflate reading at 1 Pe 2:19 (αγαθην θεου; see Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 690), although the reading receives support from 81.

[101] There are also the corrected leaps at Jd 4a, 15, and 16, as well as the corrected omission at 2 Pe 3:11.

[102] Here the itacism of μει- for μι- has aided the error by producing two occurrences of με- so close together.

[103] The omission at Jd 24b could be by a leap, but it is not clear what the *Vorlage* here was, since the last few verses of Jude have many errors. At Jd 25d the scribe perhaps omitted κρατος και εξουσια in part because he had added αυτω δοξα κρατος τιμη at 25b, although these two readings obviously do not form a simple transposition.

[104] In uncials this leap is not quite so plausible: ΘΑΥΜΑΣΤΟΝΑΥΤΟΥ.

[105] This omission of ως is discussed briefly by Beare, "Text," p. 255: "This changes the sense of the passage; it is no longer: 'If he be made to suffer for professing the Christian faith,' but 'if he be a Christian' (let him glorify God in this Name)." It seems to me more likely that the omission is just one more blunder than that the scribe is deliberately altering the text. But it may be noted that this omission of ως occurs just after the scribe has added (because of the influence of the context) two occurrences of the same word: 1 Pe 4:15a (with surely accidental support from 69), 4:15b.

[106] Quinn, "Notes," pp. 244-46, argues that P^{72}'s omission of the final clause in 1 Peter is correct. In part Quinn's claim is based on the principle that the shorter reading is more likely to be genuine, and (p. 244) he quotes with approval the statement of this principle (as applied to the manuscripts of the Mahābhārata) made by Edgerton and found in Metzger's "Recent Trends in the Textual Criticism of the Iliad and the Mahābhārata," *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963), p. 151. (This formulation is discussed below in Chapter VIII, p. 601.)

Quinn ("Notes," p. 246 n. 29) also relies on the claim by Testuz (*Papyrus*, pp. 9-10) that the small size of the codex suggests that it was made for private use, and not for a church. Accordingly, Quinn ("Notes," p. 246) states his position thusly:

> "The present writer would propose that this phrase [the final clause] originated in the liturgical assembly which attached it very early to the public reading of the letter, which, in its original edition ended at 5,14^{a} with *agapēs*. The addition could well have occurred before the end of the first century, and would appear in all copies of the letter destined for use in public reading in the Christian assemblies for worship. The scribe of P^{72} had before him an exemplar that retained the original 'short ending.' Since he himself was not producing a book

> for public reading, he had no qualms about ending the letter in the short form that he had before him. The scribes of the great uncials, copying books for use in public worship, were not so free from the pressure that current practice exerted."

Quinn's claim appears improbable for several reasons. First, it relies on the principle of *lectio brevior potior*, which has little to recommend it for the scribes of this early period, and in any case is clearly not descriptive of the copying of the scribe of P^{72}. Secondly, it is not at all clear how this liturgical addition in 1 Peter could be so widely attested, whereas other such additions involve more of a balance of textual support. See, for instance, the addition of αμην at the end of 1 Corinthians (Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 571). Thirdly, the overall quality of P^{72} hardly seems high enough to make reasonable the assumption that it and it alone has preserved the authentic text here (or anywhere else). Fourthly, Quinn's appeal to the private use for which P^{72} was intended suggests an alternative history of the readings. Might not the scribe have omitted a clause which presupposes a public reading (or at least an audience of more than one reader) when copying the book for private use?

Incidentally, one might think that this omission in P^{72} was somehow connected with the addition after the subscription: ειρηνη τω γραψαντι και τω αναγινωσκοντι. (The twenty-fifth edition of Nestle-Aland cites the subscription and the addition; the twenty-sixth edition does not cite either.) But this addition is clearly after the subscription, and moreover is repeated after the subscription to 2 Peter, where P^{72} omits nothing of the final words. (In fact, P^{72} even has αμην, which is omitted by B 1175 1241 1243 1739*^{vid} 1881 2298 pc; see Tischendorf's note, and Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 707.) Of course, it is possible that the scribe might have thought that the final phrase of 1 Peter was superfluous in the light of what he saw he was going to add later on. And one should note that the scribe's blessing refers to "the reader," and not to many readers. By the way, I have found no parallel to this blessing, although Tischendorf might just not report such extraneous information.

Since the subscription and blessing after the two letters of Peter do not form part of the text itself, I have not included them among the readings, and have also not included the correction (of an internal leap αναγινωσκοντι) to the blessing at the end of 2 Peter among the corrections.

---

[107] Although I have found no parallel, I assume that αναγενναω could be construed with just the genitive (without εκ or απο), as can, for instance, γιγνομαι (cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1410).

[108] At Jd 3b the scribe corrected by erasure one of his transpositions.

[109] Marchant A. King, "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Jude and 1 and 2 Peter," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 121 (1964), p. 57, claims that the reading of P^{72} has arisen here by the addition of "angels," but a simple transposition seems more likely. If transposition were not a factor in the placement of αγγελων, then we would have to suppose that the three different positions attested for it (in P^{72}, in א pc, in Ψ pc) were the results of (at least) three independent expansions with this word.

[110] Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 700, argues that the reading of P^{72} arose from the reading of B because of a "desire to relate the pronoun more closely . . . to the verb."

[111] Von Soden notes that 623 reads στηριξαι for στησαι in Jd 24, and this is also an influence from Ro 16:25.

[112] Beare, "Text," p. 255, notes the parallel. Quinn, "Notes," p. 247, says that στερεος is not used directly of persons in Classical Greek or the LXX, and when used indirectly it is usually pejorative. Consequently, P^{72}'s εδραιοι "is the substitution of a second- or third-century purist for the unusual *stereoi*." Quinn also refers to Col 1:23 and to the even closer parallel in Ignatius, Ad Ephesios 10:2: προς την πλανην αυτων υμεις εδραιοι τη πιστει. I suppose that Ignatius and the scribe of P^{72} were just making independent use of Col 1:23.

[113] As noted by Beare, "Text," p. 255. Perhaps the occurrence of παρακαλεω in both 1 Pe 5:12 and He 13:22 contributed to the scribe's borrowing.

[114] Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 701, calls the reading of P^{72} a "conflation" from 2 Tm 3:16, and notes that the other inauthentic reading here (found in 206 pc) seems to have been influenced by the same text but in a different way. Of course, the "conflation" involved here is not a conflation from two readings at the same place, as is perhaps the case with P^{72}'s reading at Jd 21a.

[115] Cf. also BDF, §214(5).

[116] Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, p. 1856, notes as the origin of κατεναντι in 88 915: "Rm 4 17 uö [und öfter]."

[117] I note, e.g., that D Θ 69 pc add αιωνιον to ζωην in Jn 5:40, and that 489 adds αιωνιον to ζωην in 1 Jn 5:12 (ζωην pri). However, both of these additions could also be just harmonizations to the immediate context. But general usage seems the explanation of ℵ's addition of αιωνιον to ζωην in Jn 10:10 (where von Soden cites Jn 3:16 as the source).

By the way, I do not understand why the twenty-sixth edition of Nestle-Aland cites at 1 Pe 3:7c: "P^{72} (sy^{p})." The Syriac has ܚܰܝ̈ܶܐ ܕܰܠܥܳܠܰܡ, as at Jn 3:16 and also as at Jn 5:40, where Nestle-Aland cites it without parentheses.

[118] In Westcott and Hort, Appendix, p. 106, Hort suggests that παντας--then known only in syr^{ph}--"may be right." Kubo (P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus, p. 86), following Hort, claims that "παντας must be original." Allen Wikgren, "Some Problems in Jude 5," Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament, ed. Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, Studies and Documents, Vol. XXIX (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967), p. 149, proposes to retain παντα, but says of παντας:

> "While this may be simply an accidental assimilation to εἰδότας, since πάντας is not unusual in such phrases, it may again reflect a conscious avoidance of the πάντα. It does have the effect of carrying back an emphasis upon the earlier ὑμᾶς and should not be dismissed out of hand."

Of course, Jd 5 poses several textual difficulties, but the general carelessness of the scribe of P^{72} and his specific tendency to harmonize to the context make it implausible to adopt his singular reading here.

By the way, the twenty-sixth edition of Nestle-Aland cites P^{72*} for παντας, and apparently implies that P^{72c} reads παντα. Testuz notes παντας in his text and apparatus with no indication of a correction, and, in the absence of access to photographs, I follow his edition.

[119] Beare, "Text," p. 254, says: "The syntax of the verb permits the use of the dative here, but it is probable that its appearance is due to the presence of υμειν in the line above."

[120] The υμων at Mt 5:16 seems to be a possible but less likely influence.

[121] Both αγνοια and εργασια of 460 1241 pc are more common in the New Testament than is αγνωσια.

[122] P^{72} also adds ως at 4:15a, where it has coincidental support from 69. As a nice example of coincidental agreement with a version one may note that eth agrees with P^{72} by having ከመ four times in vs. 15.

[123] Note that B* 614 1505 2495 pc add δε before ασεβης.

[124] It is also true that αποφευγω usually takes the accusative; cf. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*, and LSJ, *s.v.* ("rarely c. gen.")

[125] In the New Testament μιασμος occurs only here.

[126] Hort, *Introduction*, p. 279, cites 2 Pe 3:10 as a text where there is "textual error in all extant documents." Kubo, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, p. 16, discusses this reading, and suggests that the presence of λυομενων in vs. 11 and the presence of λυθησεται in vs. 10 "may be the very reasons the scribe added it [λυομενα]." Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 706, notes that P^{72}'s addition "overloads the context with three instances of the same verb."

[127] Cf. Chapter III, note 271, on Eph 5:31 in P^{46}.

[128] See Chapter II, note 97.

[129] See the references cited in Chapter II, note 96. I have found no parallel to P^{72}'s formation here, and it is likely that the scribe either confused similar sounds or thought that he was forming an aorist from υποκουω; however, for some verbs there is fluctuation between η and ε as augment (cf. BDF, §66[3]).

[130] Cf. the discussion of Ac 13:46c in P^{45} (της αιωνιας δοξης) in Chapter II, pp. 150-51, and notes 135-38.

[131] LSJ, *s.* πας, refers this usage to the LXX. Cf. Ex 12:44, 1 Kgs 11:8, Jr 13:11, as well as Jdg 7:4 B and Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, Vol. I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), p. 175.

[132] Cf. BDF, §275, on the position of πας. However, this transposition may just be a corrected leap.

UMI

[133] The three nonsense dittographies at 2 Pe 1:12b, 1:12c, and 2:12b, create two occurrences of και and one occurrence of ει.

[134] On the omission of ως at 1 Pe 4:16 see note 105.

[135] King, "Notes on Jude and 1 and 2 Peter," p. 57, says that the present participle "suggests a rising emphasis on works in salvation." This is perhaps possible, but seems to be a rather forced interpretation of an addition of ι.

[136] Beare, "Text," p. 254, interprets this change thusly: "'If you call "Father," him who judges,' etc., in place of 'if you invoke as Father.'"

[137] King, "Notes on Jude and 1 and 2 Peter," p. 57, says that P^{72}'s word here is of "striking intensity," and is "virtually a comment by this or some preceding scribe."

[138] See Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 156.

[139] *Ibid*., p. 161.

[140] *Ibid*., pp. 155-56. The scribe also doubles λ at 2 Pe 2:10a.

[141] King, "Notes on Jude and 1 and 2 Peter," p. 57.

[142] *Ibid*. Kilpatrick ("Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," p. 39) also notes: "there is nothing to suggest that this library [from which P^{72} comes] was other than a library of orthodox literature. There are no Gnostic or other heretical works in it."

[143] "Some Remarks," p. 264. Cf. also Beare, "Text," p. 255 (where the reading is glossed with "an unconscious inclination to Patripassianism?"), and Kubo, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, p. 12. Martini, *Epistulae*, p. XIX, notes:

> "Un caso è particolarmente notevole, perché sembra connesso con qualche intenzione dottrinale dello scriba o del suo ambiente per quanto riguarda la Cristologia. Esso è la lettura θεου per χριστου in 1 P 5,11 [*sic*; read 5,1], a cui è da assimilare nello stesso codice la lettura θεος χριστος nella lettera di Giuda al v. 5."

UMI

[144] At least κ̅ς̅ seems more likely to engender χ̅ρ̅ς̅ than does ι̅ς̅ (since the initial letters both look and sound somewhat alike), and Cl^{lat} has the conflation *dominus deus* (Birdsall, "The Text of Jude in P^{72}," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 14 [1963], p. 396, cites this reading as supporting P^{72}).

[145] Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 726, says that the reading "is probably a scribal blunder; otherwise one would expect that Χριστός would be represented also in other witnesses." The alternative presumed here--either a blunder or a conflation from extant witnesses--appears not to take seriously the possibility of theological motivation.

Kubo, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, p. 12, comments on this reading: "This adds to Beare's suspicions that there may be some inclination toward Patripassianism in the scribe." I again fail to see how the reading of P^{72} suggests any such inclinations. Wikgren, "Some Problems," p. 148, remarks that the reading, "though possibly a conflate text, looks like a conscious attempt to preserve and even make more explicit the logos thought, while at the same time avoiding the ambiguity of Ἰησοῦς [Joshua or Jesus]."

[146] Kubo, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, p. 14, just lists this omission among others, and does not give it special attention.

[147] I believe that the situation here is in contrast to what we find in P^{46}; see Chapter III, pp. 278-81.

[148] We can gain a rough idea of frequency of error by computing singulars per verse. There are 191 verses in Jd, 1 Pe, and 2 Pe, and P^{72} has 98 significant singulars, an average of .5 singular per verse. But there are 17 in the last 6 verses of Jude, for an average of 2.8 per verse. Indeed, this figure perhaps understates the rate of error, since several variations are collapsed into Jd 22-23.

[149] King, "Notes on Jude and 1 and 2 Peter," p. 56, says:

> "The one really poor section of text is the final five verses of Jude. [I believe that King probably means Jd 20-25, the last six verses.] Here much of the order and several of the words are unique so that though the meaning is, in general, the same as the regular text

> one wonders whether the exemplar was broken off at this point and the scribe resorted to memory."

It is indeed difficult to imagine that the scribe was seriously intending to reproduce a text which lay before him.

[150] Cf. Carroll D. Osburn, "The Text of Jude 22-23," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 63 (1972), pp. 139-44. Kubo, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*, pp. 12-13, says that the "variant in Jude 22 [in P^{72}] is probably original," and later on (pp. 89-92) argues that the original reading was very close to that in P^{72}. Birdsall, "Text," pp. 397-99, also argues that P^{72} is correct here. By the way, Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, p. 107, say: "Some primitive error evidently affects the passage." Cf. also the discussion in Metzger, *Commentary*, pp. 727-29.

[151] Gordon D. Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism--Which?" *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), p. 182, makes a comment on singular readings which is relevant to the reading at hand. He says that

> "when one opts for singular readings in such witnesses as P^{66}, ℵ, D, 1241 . . . must it not be shown that these MSS have a generally overall reliability that would cause one to side with them *even when they depart from their own relatives*, not to mention the entire textual tradition? In these instances such readings are not necessarily condemned because they are singular, but, as is the case with P^{66}, ℵ, D, and 1241 in John, because they are singular in MSS whose texts abound in singular readings of patently secondary character."

[152] Cf. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.* LSJ, *s.* επισκοπος, note that this word can be construed with the dative, as is the case in P^{72}'s reading.

CHAPTER VII

THE SCRIBE OF P^{75}

P^{75} is a manuscript which originally contained the Gospels of Luke and John, and which dates from about 200.[1] It is calculated that the codex was composed of 72 folios,[2] but only 51 have survived,[3] some of these indeed being quite fragmentary. The text is, though, fairly well preserved from Lk 5:37 to Lk 18:18, and from Lk 22:4 to Jn 13:10, with the end of Luke and the beginning of John occurring on f. 44^r.[4] The remains are in the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana at Cologny-Geneva, and are known as Papyrus Bodmer XIV (for Luke) and Papyrus Bodmer XV (for John).

The edition by Martin and Kasser includes a transcript, which is of commendable accuracy, and excellent photographs of most of the extant folios.[5] However, the apparatus is restricted to observations on corrections and doubtful readings, and to noting divergences from the 23rd edition of Nestle-Aland.[6] Thus, as was the case with the apparatus attached to P^{66} and P^{72}, one cannot rely on the information given by Martin and Kasser for an understanding of the textual relationships of P^{75}, or for the isolation of the singular readings of P^{75}.[7]

Fortunately, therefore, there are some other studies which provide more detailed textual information. In particular, there is a quite careful collation of the entire manuscript published by Aland,[8] citing the corrections in P^{75} and the support for all variations from the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland, with the exception of itacisms and the like.[9] Aland's list was thus quite useful as a control on our list of singulars, although a few omissions were noted, a few corrections were made in the supposed readings of the papyrus, and a few errors in Aland's textual data were detected.[10]

Furthermore, for the text of Luke Martini has presented a thorough study, including a collation of P^{75} against B.[11] There is, however, no one list of singular readings of P^{75} to be found in Martini's work; rather, Martini separates the singular readings proper (his "lezioni singolari") from the obvious errors (his "errori palesi"), and gives these readings in two lists.[12] These lists, and Martini's comments, were very helpful, but were also found to contain a few errors.[13] Martini also furnishes a list of corrections present in Papyrus Bodmer XIV.[14]

Subsequently, an article by Edwards presented several new readings for P^{75}, based on an examination of the papyrus, including the placement of a few new fragments.[15] On the basis of Edwards' report ten additional singulars were discovered in the text of John:[16] 5:30, 6:1, 6:5a, 7:32, 11:29, 12:24, 12:36, 14:25, 14:27, and 14:28. A few of these are more or less doubtful, but they seem more likely than a few other proposed readings which I have not accepted.[17]

The textual relationships of P^{75} have been studied in detail, and, as is well known, it has been shown to have a remarkable closeness to B.[18] In fact, P^{75} and B are the most closely related of any ancient manuscripts of the New Testament.[19] Not only do their texts agree over 90% of the time,[20] but they are the only witnesses for rather many readings (and for which B was previously the sole support).[21] Since it seems certain that B cannot be a direct descendant from P^{75},[22] it is thus demonstrated that both P^{75} and B derive from an archetype which must go back to at least the second century, and which has been quite faithfully preserved in these two manuscripts. Thus, the possibility of B's being the result of a fourth century "revision" or "recension" is excluded.[23] Moreover, these results indicate that in the vast majority of cases the Vorlage of P^{75} had the reading which we now find in B. And the list of singulars confirms this view, since there are, it appears, only two cases where P^{75}'s reading probably did not derive from the reading now found in B (Lk 10:39 and 16:19), and one further reading of P^{75} which may not have derived from the reading of B (Jn 6:18). Moreover, where P^{75} and B disagree, P^{75} often has other Alexandrian support, including support from the Coptic.[24]

As a further control on the present study, the list of singulars was collated against B, W, Θ, 892, and 1241, and was also collated against P^{45} and P^{66}. As a consequence, Lk 6:48 and 10:13a were found to be supported by W,[25] Lk 14:18 was found to be supported by Θ,[26] and Jn 8:46 was found to be supported by 1241.[27] As usual, the collations did permit further accuracy and completeness in the textual citations.

The final list of singulars, then, consists of 108 readings from Luke and 83 readings from John, for a total of 191.[28] In the following list support which was found for the readings of P^{75} within the files of the International Greek New Testament Project (for Luke) is included in double brackets ("[[...]]"), but, in accordance with the comments in Chapter I, such support does not remove a reading from the list of singulars.

Luke

3:22 το πνευμα ς rell : π̣̅ν̅α̅ (= πνευμα) P^{75vid} pr sp

** 4:41 λαλειν ς rell : [λ]ε̣γ̣ε̣ι̣ν̣ P^{75} 485 2193*

5:1 εγενετο δε ς rell : και εγενετο P^{75}

(n) 6:14 τον αδελφον ς rell : [του] α̣δ̣ελφου P^{75}

6:23 μισθος υμων ς rell : [μισθος υ]μ̣ω̣[ν εστ]ι̣
P^{75vid} it$^{a,aur,b,c,ff^2,r^1}$

** 6:41 δε pri ς rell : om P^{75} 1093 1219 1424 [[179
489 1365*]]

** 6:48a πλημμυρας ς pm : πλημμυρης P^{75} W

6:48b οικοδομησθαι vel οικοδομεισθαι ℵ B L W Ξ 33 157
579 892 1241 : ω[κοδομησθα]ι vel ω[κοδομεισθα]ι
P^{75} [[ωκοδομεισθαι 1654]] : aliter ς rell

7:6 λεγων αυτω ς ℵ^{c} rell : [αυ]τω λ̣ε̣γ̣ω[ν] P^{75} :
λεγων ℵ* Θ 700 : λεγων προς αυτον 69

(o) 7:24 προς τους οχλους ς ℵ^{c} rell (Ξ* om τους) :
προ̣ς̣ το̣υ̣ ο̣χλου P^{75} : τοις οχλοις ℵ* D E F G
H V Γ Δ Λ Ω 579 892 pm

** 8:7 αυτο ς pm : αυτα P^{75} 472

(n) 8:13 αφιστανται ς rell : αφισταται P^{75} [[1573]]

(o) 8:18 ος αν γαρ ℵ B L Ξ 157 579 945 983 (εαν) :
οσον γαρ P^{75} : ος γαρ αν vel ος γαρ εαν ς
rell : ος γαρ W 28

Luke

8:21 προς αυτους ς $W^{c(man\ 1)}$ rell : προς αυτον
P^{75} $it^{b,c}$: αυτοις D W* 127 279 569

8:22 και αυτος ς $ℵ^{a}$ rell : και P^{75} :
αυτος 121 : om ℵ* D

(o) 8:32 επετρεψεν ς rell : επεστρεψεν P^{75} [[1604 1^{70}]]

(o) 8:38 εδειτο $ℵ^{a}$ B C^{2} L X 33 700 892 1396 : [ε]δ̣ετο
P^{75} [[Γ* 273]] : εδεετο ς ℵ* et c C* rell :
εδεειτο A P 1187 1241 : ηρωτα D

9:1 παντα τα δαιμονια ς rell : [παν]τ̣α̣ δ̣α̣[ιμο]νια
P^{75vid} pr sp [[747*]] : πασαν (παντα D^{2})
δαιμονιον D

9:9 ουτος ς rell : om P^{75}

(n) 9:10 διηγησαντο ς rell : διησαντο̣ P^{75}

(o) 9:19 αποκριθεντες ς rell : αποκρινθεν[τες] P^{75}

9:24 ενεκεν ς rell (69 δι εμε pro ενεκεν εμου) :
εινεκεν P^{75}

9:34 αυτους sec ℵ B C L 157 435 1241 : om P^{75} :
εκεινους ς P^{45} rell : αυτον 1604

9:42a δε sec ς rell : om P^{75} [[0211 22* 38*]]

(o) 9:42b ιασατο ς rell : ισα̣το P^{75} : aliter D

9:48a δεχεται pri ς rell : δεχηται P^{75}

9:48b και ος αν P^{45} B K L U Ξ Ψ 33 69 945 1071 1187 :
και ος δ αν P^{75} : και ος εαν ς rell :
και ος ℵ 1229

Luke

(n) 9:52 εισηλθον ς rell : εισηλθε̣ν P^{75} : om 477

10:1 ανεδειξεν ς rell : ενεδειξεν P^{75} : απεδειξεν D : εδειξεν 245

(o) 10:2 εργατας ς rell : [ε]ργατης P^{75}

(o) 10:7 μενετε ς rell : [με]ν̣τε P^{75}

** 10:13a σιδωνι ς rell : σιδονι P^{75} W (σιδονει) [[21 66 115 422 788 1242 1279 1321 1542]]

10:13b εγενηθησαν P^{45} ℵ B D L Θ Ξ f^{13} 33 157 700 892 1071 1241 1424 pc : εγεννηθησαν P^{75} [[579]] : εγενοντο ς rell

10:30 απηλθον ς rell : απηλθαν P^{75}

10:31 κατα συγκυρειαν ς P^{75*} rell (συνκ- P^{45} A W Θ) : κατα συγτυχειαν P^{75c} : κατα τυχα D : om it

10:39 του ιησου ς P^{45} A B^3 (sed restitutum του κυριου) C^2 rell : $\overline{ιυ}$ (= ιησου) P^{75} : του κυριου P^3 ℵ B* D L Ξ 569 579 892 : αυτου C* 1038

11:11a αιτησει τον πατερα B 238 1241 syr^{pmg} : αιτησει $\overline{πρα}$ (= πατερα) P^{75} : τον πατερα αιτησει ς rell (D W 700 1071 pc pon ο υιος ante αιτησει) : πατερα αιτησει P^{45} M f^1 pc

(n) 11:11b ιχθυν ς rell : ισχυν P^{75} : ωον 579

(o) 11:18 σατανας ς rell : σατανος P^{75}

Luke

(n) 11:19 εν τινι ς rell : εκ τινι P^{75} : εν τι D

** 11:22a επελθων ς pm : ελθων P^{75} 945 983 1241 1689
[[H* 7 267 273 1077 1226 1654]]

(o) 11:22b σκυλα ς rell : σκυλλα P^{75} [[477 1205 1221
1242 1279 2613]] : σκευη F K Π al

11:23 σκορπιζει ς rell : σκορπισει P^{75}

11:27 ταυτα ς rell : om P^{75}

11:31a νοτου ς P$^{75c(man\ 2)}$ rell : om P^{75*}

** 11:31b αυτους ς rell : αυτην P^{75} P^{45} 245 1424 it^{d}

11:32 πλειον ς rell : πλειονα P^{75}

11:39a το δε ς rell : το τε P^{75} : τα δε U : το 0124

(n) 11:39b υμων ς rell : υμιν P^{75} : om 1424

11:42 οτι ς rell : οτε P^{75} : om P^{45}

11:46 υμων ς rell : om P^{75} it^{c,e}

11:51 ταυτης ς rell : αυτης P^{75}

(n) 11:53 εξελθοντος ℵ B C L 33 579 1241 : εξελθοντες
P^{75} : λεγοντος ς rell (69 om, 28 λεγοντι)

(n) 12:11a εισφερωσιν P^{45} ℵ B L X f^{1} 33 157 579 700 892
1241 pc : εις εισφερωσιν P^{75} : προσφερωσιν
ς rell (E* Λ al -ρουσιν, 1355 προφ-) :
φερωσιν D

Luke

(n)	12:11b	μη μεριμνησητε ℵ B L Q R X Θ Ψ 0191 f^{1} f^{13} 33 579 700 892 1241 pc : μη μεριμνη μη μεριμνησητε P^{75} : μη μεριμνατε ς rell : μη προμεριμνατε D
**	12:24	υμεις ς rell : om P^{75} 1047
	12:28	δε ς rell : τε P^{75}
**	12:29	φαγητε ς rell : φαγησθε P^{75} f^{13} (φαγεσθε 1689)
	12:31	αυτου ℵ B D* L Ψ 892 pc : om P^{75} : του θεου ς P^{45} D^{2} rell
	12:42	διδοναι ς $\aleph^{c}$ rell : διαδιδοναι P^{75} : δουναι N W Θ Ψ 28 700 1241 1424 pc : διαδουναι ℵ* : διαδοναι 118
**	12:45a	αυτου ς rell : εαυτου P^{75} N 33 pc
	12:45b	τε ς rell : τι P^{75} : δε 945 1071 : om f^{13} 660
(n)	12:46	διχοτομησει ς rell : δοχοτομησε̣ι̣ P^{75}
(o)	12:55	πνεοντα ς rell : πνευοντα P^{75} [[179 372]] : πλεοντα D 1194
(o)	12:58	παραδωσει P^{45} ℵ A B D Θ 070 f^{13} 157 167 1241 : παραδοσει P^{75} : παραδω ς rell
	13:1a	αυτω sec ς rell : om P^{75}
	13:1b	των sec ς rell : om P^{75} [[1780]]
**	13:13	αυτη ς rell : επ αυτη P^{75} Θ 716 1216

Luke

13:14 δε ς rell : om P^{75}

(n) 13:16 ουσαν ς rell : σαν P^{75c} : υ̣ο̣σαν P$^{75*(?)}$

13:25 ο οικοδεσποτης ς rell : ο δεσποτης P^{75}

** 13:30 εσχατοι pri ς rell : οι [ε]σχατοι P^{75} 472 579 [[38 179 1228 2757*]]

** 13:31 θελει σε ς pm : σ̣[ε θε]λ̣ει P^{75} P^{45} W it^{aur}

13:34 την εαυτης (εαυτου ℵ* 16 1071) νοσσιαν υπο (επι 1279) τας πτερυγας (472 add αυτης) ς rell : om P^{75} : τα εαυτης νοσσια υπο (επι 1241) τας πτερυγας (213 add αυτης) A K M Π f^{1} 157 1241 al : τα νοσσια αυτης υπο τας πτερυγας D : υπο τας πτερυγας την εαυτης νοσσιαν 1012 : η επισυναγει τα εαυτης νοσσια υπο τας πτερυγας 998

14:1 παρατηρουμενοι ς rell : παρητηρουμενοι P^{75} : παρατηρουντες 661

14:8a εις γαμους ς rell (γαμον D 1604) : om P^{75} it^{b} syr$^{pmg\ ms}$ cop^{sa}

** 14:8b σου ς rell : om P^{75} 579 [[4 1188 1452]]

(o) 14:9 τουτω ς rell : τουτο P^{75} [[Λ Ω* 047 0211 472 828 1071 1424 1579 pc]]

14:10 σοι δοξα ς ℵ^{a} rell (1038 pon σοι ante εσται) : δοξα σοι P^{75} it^{a} : δοξα ℵ* 157 234

Luke

** 14:18 ηρξαντο ς rell : ηρξατο P^{75} θ [[485* 1008 1014* 1200 1216 1279]]

14:21 και pri ς rell : om P^{75}

14:25a συνεπορευοντο ς rell : συνπορευοντο P^{75}

** 14:25b αυτω ς pm : om P^{75} 16 [[1579]]

14:26 ετι τε B L R Δ 33 892 pc : ετι P^{75} it^{a,e,r^1} Or : ετι δε ς P^{45} rell

14:28a θελων ς Λ* rell : θελει P^{75} : ο θελων P^{45} E H M S U V W Γ Λ Ω f^{13} 565 700 1010 pm

14:28b πρωτον καθισας ς rell (X Γ Δ al καθησας) : καθισας πρωτον P^{75}

(n) 14:29 θεντος ς rell : θεντες P^{75}

** 14:32a τα προς ς pm : om P^{75} pc

(o) 14:32b ειρηνην ς rell : ειρηνη P^{75}

(o) 14:33 μαθητης ς rell : μαθητας P^{75}

14:34 αλας pri et αλας sec ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell : αλας et αλα P^{75} : αλα et αλα ℵ* D W

** 15:6 τους γειτονας ς pm : γειτονας P^{75} θ 1093 [[349]]

15:12 ο δε $ℵ^{c}$ A B L 579 892 1047 1071 1241 : om P^{75} : και sec ς ℵ* rell

** 15:13 συναγαγων ς rell : συναγων P^{75} 472

15:17 αρτων ς rell : αρτοις P^{75} : αρτον θ : αρτου 71 565 1093

Luke

15:18 τον ουρανον ς rell : ουρανον P^{75}

15:19 με ς rell : μοι P^{75} [[1342]]

** 15:22 εξενεγκατε ς pm : ενεγκατε P^{75} 579 1241 [[5]]

15:30 δε ς rell : om P^{75}

(o) 16:4 ινα οταν ς rell : ιν οταν P^{75} : ινα αν ℵ : ινα 267

(o) 16:8 φρονιμωτεροι ς rell : φρονιμοτεροι P^{75} [[S Ω 230 472 pc]] : om 047

** 16:18 ο sec ς rell : om P^{75} 1241 pc [[157*]]

16:19 πλουσιος ονοματι νινευη(ς) cop^{sa} (ⲣⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲟ ⲉⲡⲉϥⲣⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲩⲏ) cdd apud scholiastam in cdd 36 et 37 : πλουσιος ονοματι νευης P^{75} : πλουσιος ς rell

16:22a αποθανειν ς rell : εν τω αποθανειν P^{75}

** 16:22b απεθανεν δε και ς rell (124 om και) : απεθανεν και P^{75} 267 343

16:27 δε ς rell : ουν P^{75}

16:30 πορευθη ς rell : εγ[ε]ρ̣θη P^{75} [[1780]] : αναστη ℵ : αναστη και πορευθη 69

** 16:31 αναστη ς pm : εγερθη P^{75} 579

(n) 17:4 αφησεις ς rell : [α]φησει P^{75} [[565 726 1213]] : αφες D H Λ 157 1573

(o) 17:5 προσθες ς rell : π̣ροσθεν P^{75} [[1279]]

** 17:28 επωλουν ς rell : επολουν P^{75} θ [[422 1071 1229]]

Luke

(o) 17:31 οπισω ς rell : οπισσω P^{75} [[ωπησσω 179]]

(o) 18:9 ε̣ξουθενουντες̣ P^{75*} B 71 115 259 543 1047 1071
1207 : ε̣ξουδενουντες̣ P^{75c} [[0139]] :
εξουθενουντας ς rell : εξουδενουντας N 1223 :
εξουθενουνται 2145 : εξουθενουσιν 1093

(n) 18:11 ωσπερ ς rell : ωσπ̣ε̣ρ̣ .. (ως ?) P^{75} :
ως D L Q Ψ 047 28 892 1241 pc

22:24 δε και ς rell : και P^{75} cop^{sa} [[270]] :
δε ℵ 127* 475 1093

22:55 ο ς rell : om P^{75} [[38 1542]] : και ο D

** 23:2 κωλυοντα ς rell : κολυοντα P^{75} Θ [[H* L*
472 828 1206 pc, κολυωντα 179 273 579]]

** 23:3 αυτω ς rell : om P^{75} 047 280 544 it^{pt} vg
$cop^{sa,bo^{mss}}$ [[6 178 422 1685]]

23:6 ε̣π̣ηρωτησ̣[ε]ν ς P^{75*vid} rell :
ηρωτησ̣[ε]ν P^{75c}

23:8 ηλπιζεν ς rell : ηλπισεν P^{75} [[0124]] :
ελπιζειν T 157 433

23:11 και εμπαιξας ς rell : εμπαιξας P^{75}

** 23:12a εγενοντο ς rell (D aliter) : εγενετο P^{75} 1
209 1573 [[131^c 178 205]]

(n) 23:12b προυπηρχον ς rell : προυπηρχεν P^{75} :
προυπηρχοντο ℵ*

Luke

(n) 23:18 δε pri ς rell : δε αυτον P^{75} : om T* f^{13} :
ουν W : δε παλιν 1355 : δε παντες 661 :
και (ante ανεκραξαν) 213

(n) 23:25 ον ς rell : ην P^{75}

(n) 23:29a ερχονται ς rell : ερχεται P^{75} [[1443
1630]] : ελευσονται D f^{13}

(o) 23:29b κοιλιαι ς rell : κοιλια P^{75}

(o) 23:33 εσταυρωσαν ς rell : εστρωσαν P^{75}

(n) 24:5 αυτας ς rell : αυτους P^{75} [[5 l^{70}]]

(n) 24:18 ταις ημεραις ταυταις ς rell τη ημεραις
ταυταις P$^{75c(man 1)}$: τη ημερα ταυτη P^{75*}

24:21 ηλπιζομεν ς B^{3} (B* -ζαμεν) rell : ηλπικαμε̄
(= ηλπικαμεν) P^{75} it^{a,d} : ηλπιζωμεν X pc :
ελπιζομεν ℵ P Δ Θ (-ζωμεν) Λ Π 69 472 579 al

24:27 εν πασαις (ℵ D om) ταις γραφαις τα (om L) περι
εαυτου (αυτου D E L M V W X Θ Ω f^{1} f^{13} 33 472
579 1093 al) ς rell : τα περι εαυτου εν
πασαις ταις γραφαις P^{75} [[l^{859} (αυτου)]]

24:28 την ς rell : om P^{75} [[0211 1247]]

(o) 24:30 λαβων ς rell : λαβον P^{75} [[179 l^{1056c}]]

** 24:47 επι ς rell : εν P^{75} 1194 [[1007 1338]]

(o) 24:50 επαρας ς rell : απαρας P^{75}

John

1:7 μαρτυριαν ς rell : μαρτϋριον P^{75}

(n) 1:10 ην ς P^{75*} rell : ηηεν P^{75c}

(n) 1:19 απεστειλαν ς rell : απεστειλεν P^{75}

** 1:26 εστηκεν ς pm : ιστηκει P^{75} 22 (εισ-)
660 (εισ-) 1071 (εισ-) Eus (εισ-)

** 1:27 αξιος ς rell : ικανος P^{75} P^{66} 472

(o) 1:34 καγω ς P^{75*} rell : και ε̣γω P$^{75c^{vid}}$:
και πυρι καγω C* cop^{sa} Or

1:40 ακολουθησαντων ς rell : ηκολουθ̣ησαντων P^{75}

2:1 εν κανα ς rell : εν τη κανα P^{75}

(n) 2:6a ιουδαιων ς rell : ιδαιων P^{75}

(n) 2:6b χωρουσαι ς rell : χωρησαι P^{75}

(n) 2:6c μετρητας ς rell (μετριτας F K L Γ Θ Λ al) :
μητρας P^{75}

** 2:10 πρωτον τον καλον οινον ς rell : τον
κα̣[λ]ο̣ν ο̣ι̣ν̣ον π̣ρ̣[ω]τον P^{75} 892 it^{a,e}

** 2:14 πωλουντας ς rell : πωλοῡ/τας (= πωλουντας)
τας P^{75} 213

(n) 2:16 οικον sec ς rell : οικου P^{75}

** 2:24 εαυτον αυτοις ς pm : αυτοις P^{75} 280 579 Did

(o) 3:8a πνει ς rell (L πνεει) : $\overline{\text{πνει}}$ (= πνευματι) P^{75}

3:8b οιδας ς rell : οιδες P^{75}

John

(o) 3:27 λαμβανειν ς P^{66} rell : λαμβανει P^{75} :
λαβειν ℵ 348 1279 pc : λαλειν 1579

** 3:28 ειπον ς rell : ειπον οτι P^{75} P^{66} 485
700 $it^{aur,e,f,ff^2,l}$

(n) 4:5 ερχεται ς rell : εερχεται P^{75c} :
εερχε... P^{75*}(?)

** 4:9 ουσης γυναικος σαμαριτιδος ς pm :
γυναικος ουσης σαμαρειτιδος P^{75} 2768 Cyr

4:14 αλλα ς rell : α̣λλο P^{75}

4:17 ειπεν ς rell : λεγει P^{75} it^{r^1}

4:18 ειρηκας ς rell : ειπας P^{75}

(o) 4:35 επαρατε ς rell : απαρατε P^{75}

4:37 εν γαρ τουτω ⊙ λογος εστιν (D 301 482 pc εστιν
ο λογος, ς P^{66} ℵ A C^3 D Θ f^{13} pm add ο)
αληθινος (αληθης f^1 22 138 579 [αληθης εστιν]
1071) οτι αλλος εστιν ο σπειρων (K θεριζων)
και αλλος ο θεριζων ς rell : om P^{75}

4:41 πλειους ς rell : πλειον P^{75} it^{e,r^1} :
πληθος Θ

4:47 προς αυτον ς rell : om P^{75}

4:54 δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν ς P^{66} rell :
εποιησεν δευτερον σημειον P^{75} :
δευτερον εποιησεν σημειον ℵ W^{supp} :
σημειον δευτερον εποιησεν Ω 28 399 1200

John

** 5:5 ετη ς P$^{75c(man\ 2)}$ rell : om P^{75*} 579

5:12 αυτον ς rell : om P^{75}

5:13 ο γαρ ς rell : ο δε P^{75} it$^{aur,f,ff^2,r^1}$

(n) 5:15 τοις ιουδαιοις ς rell : τọις ιουδαιους P^{75}

** 5:16 εποιει ς rell : εποιησεν P^{75} 579

** 5:20 θαυμαζητε ς rell : θαυμασητε P^{75} 1241

5:25 ωρα ς rell : om P^{75} it$^{ff^2}$

5:30 η εμη ς rell : ẹμη̣ P^{75}

5:34 την μαρτυριαν λαμβανω ς rell (1093 ελαβον, 1241 pon ου ante λαμβανω) : [λαμβανω] τ̣η̣[ν μα]ρ̣τυριαν P^{75vid}

6:1 απηλθεν ο ιησους ς rell : [ο ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) απηλθε]ν̣ P^{75vid} it$^{ff^2}$

6:5a ποθεν ς rell : π[ο]θ̣ε̣[ν εαυτοις] P^{75vid}

6:5b αγορασωμεν ς rell (-ομεν ς K U V pm) : [αγορασ]ω̣σιν̣ P^{75}

6:17 εληλυθει ς rell (ηληλυθη Θ) : εγεγον̣[ε]ι̣ P^{75} : εληλυθεν 251

6:18 διηγειρετο ς rell (διηγηρετο Θ) : διεγειρετο B G L U V Λ f^{13} 1241 al : δ̣[ιηγειρ]ατ̣ο vel δ̣[ιεγειρ]ατ̣ο P^{75}

6:19 της θαλασσης ς rell : την θαλασσ[αν] P^{75}

John

6:32 τον αρτον sec ς rell : τον αρτον τ̣ο̣ν P^{75}

(o) 6:35 ερχομενος ς rell : ερχομνος P^{75}

6:39a τουτο δε ς rell : τουτ̣ο̣ P^{75}

6:39b δεδωκεν ς rell : εδωκεν P^{75}

6:50 και μη ς rell : και ου̣ [μη] P^{75} : μη D^{2}

6:57 πατερα ς rell : πατερα μου P^{75} syr^{s}

7:12a οτι ς rell : om P^{75vid} pr sp

(o) 7:12b ου ς P^{66} rell (οτι pro ου αλλα f^{1} 565 2768) :
ουκ P^{75} : ουχι K T 138 544 1223 1355 pc

7:13 περι αυτου ς rell : υπ[ερ αυ]του P^{75vid} :
om L : αυτω 7

7:17 ποιειν ς rell : om P^{75} : ποιη W

7:18 την δοξαν την ιδιαν ς rell : τ[ην] ι̣διαν̣ P^{75}

7:23 ολον ανθρωπον ς rell : $\overline{\text{ανον}}$ (= ανθρωπον)
[ο]λον P^{75} : ανθρωπον X 213 Cyr : ολον 543

(o) 7:32 υπηρετας ς rell : υπηρει̣τας P^{75} : om 270 579

7:33a ο ιησους ς rell (T confuse οτει$\overline{\text{ς}}$ pro ο $\overline{\text{ις}}$ ετι) :
$\overline{\text{ις}}$ (= ιησους) P^{75}

7:33b πεμψαντα ς P^{66c} (P^{66*vid} μεψψντα) rell :
πεμψοντα P^{75}

7:34 ζητησετε ς rell : [ζ]η̣τησατ[ε] P^{75} :
ζητειτε Π* 69 998

(n) 7:35a ιουδαιοι ς rell : ι̣δαιοι P^{75}

** 7:35b διδασκειν ς rell : [δι]δ̣ασκει P^{75} 579 (et
om και)

John

(o) 7:46 ουδεποτε ς rell : [ουδε]πωτε P^{75}

(o) 7:49 επαρατοι P^{66} ℵ B T W Θ Ψ f^{1} 33 565 : απαρατοι P^{75} : επικαταρατοι ς rell

8:17 αληθης εστιν ς rell : εστ[ιν] α̣λ̣[ηθ]ης P^{75} : αληθης 1675

8:19 ουτε pri ς P^{75*} rell : ουδε pri P^{75c}

(o) 8:21 τη αμαρτια ς rell : τη αμαρτια̅ (= αμαρτιαν) P^{75}

** 8:22 εγω ς rell : om P^{75} 348

8:24 πιστευσητε ς rell : πιστευητε P^{75}

** 8:34 αυτοις ς $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ (P^{66*} αυτω) rell : om P^{75} 0141 $it^{b,e}$

8:38 ποιειτε ς rell (-ητε Χ Λ al) : λαλ̣[ειτε] P^{75} : λαλειτε και ποιειτε 1689

** 8:46 ελεγχει ς rell (E* M Λ al -χη) : ελεγξει P^{75} 1241

** 8:52 λεγεις ς rell : λεγεις οτι P^{75} 0124

8:55 ειπω ς rell : ειπω υμιν P^{75}

9:8 εστιν ς rell : om P^{75}

** 9:21 αυτος ηλικιαν εχει αυτον ερωτησατε αυτος ς pm : αυτος ηλικιαν εχει αυτος P^{75} 0124

** 9:39 ηλθον ς rell : εληλυθα P^{75} 579 892 1071 pc

** 9:41 η (vel αι) ουν ς pm : και η P^{75} 138 1093 1241 (και αι) cop^{bo} syr^{hr} arm Cyr

John

** 10:2 εισερχομενος ς rell : ερχομενος P^{75} 2768

10:7 η θυρα ς rell : ο ποιμην P^{75} cop^{sa,ach,fay}

** 10:9 εαν ς rell : αν P^{75} W

10:12 τα προβατα ιδια ς P^{66} rell : τα προβατα τα
ιδια P^{75} : ιδια τα προβατα P^{45} Θ it^{b}

10:17 μου ς rell : om P^{75} it^{e}

(n) 10:29 ο πατηρ μου ς P^{66} א^{c} rell : ο πατηρ [μο]ι
P^{75} : ο πατηρ א* 13 892^{supp} 1424

10:32 εργα εδειξα υμιν καλα B 1170 1242 : [εδειξα
υ]μ̣ι̣ν̣ ε̣ργα καλα P^{75} : καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν
ς P^{66} rell : εργα καλα εδειξα υμιν P^{45vid} א
A K Θ (εδιδαξα) Λ Π Ψ f^{1} 33 157 544 565 1241
2768 al : εργα εδειξα υμιν W 220 : καλα
εδειξα υμιν 127* 245 : καλα εδειξα υμιν
εργα 047

(o) 11:5 την αδελφην αυτης ς P^{66c} (P^{66*} om αυτης) rell :
[της] α̣δελφης αυτης P^{75}

(n) 11:11 ο φιλος ς rell : η φιλος P^{75}

11:12 σωθησεται ς rell : εγερθη̣σεται P^{75}

11:13a του θανατου ς P^{66c} (P^{66*} της κοιμησεως) rell :
θανατου P^{75}

** 11:13b οτι ς rell : om P^{75} 983

John

(o) 11:29 ηρχετο ℵ B C* L W X Ψ 33 579 892^{supp} 1071 1241 pc : η̣ρχιετ̣[ο] P^{75} : ερχεται ς P^{45} P^{66} C^{2} rell

11:31a ηκολουθησαν ς rell : και ηκο[λουθησαν] P^{75}

** 11:31b λεγοντες ς pm : δοξ[α]ζοντες P^{75} 33

12:24 εαν ς rell : α̣ν P^{75vid}

(o) 12:27 αλλα ς rell : α[λ]α̣ P^{75}

(o) 12:36 γενη[σθ]ε̣ ς P^{75*vid} rell : γενν̣η[ση]ε̣ P$^{75c vid}$

12:38 ον ειπεν ς rell : om P^{75}

12:48 εμε ς rell : με P^{75}

14:9 εωρακεν (vel εορακεν) ς rell it^{d,e} : εωρακεν και P^{75} it vg cop$^{ach^{2},bo^{mss}}$ Ir Or^{pt} Tert Nov Lcf Hil Aug

14:19 εγω ζω ς rell : ζω εγω P^{75}

14:21 αγαπηθησεται ς rell : τηρηθησ̣[ε]τ̣[αι] P^{75}

14:22 ο ς rell : om P^{75}

(n) 14:25 υμιν pri ς rell : υμ̣ω̣ν̣ P^{75} : om 482

14:27 δειλιατω ς rell : δειλιατε P^{75}

(n) 14:28 προς τον πατερα ς rell (G f^{13} add μου) : προς υμας P^{75}

Orthography.--Of the 191 singulars in P^{75}, 38 (19.9%) may be considered variations in orthography. Our list, of course, does not include the itacisms, which Colwell put at "about 145,"[29] and to which Martini devoted a section of his work.[30] Colwell claims that P^{75} has the fewest itacisms per amount of text of the three papyri he studies, but his figures suggest that P^{45} ranks about the same.[31] Among the six papyri analyzed here, P^{75}'s percentage of orthographic singulars is about the same as that of P^{46} and P^{47}, much lower than that of P^{72}, but much higher than that of P^{45} and P^{66}.

The classification of the 38 orthographic singulars is as follows:

Elision: Lk 16:4 (ιν οταν).[32]

Lack of crasis: Jn 1:34 (και εγω).

ουκ for ου: Jn 7:12b.[33]

Double and single consonants:[34]

-σσ- for -σ-: Lk 17:31.[35]

-νν- for -ν-: Jn 12:36.[36]

-λλ- for -λ-: Lk 11:22b.[37]

-λ- for -λλ-: Jn 12:27.[38]

There are also the following confusions of consonants:

Addition of medial ν: Lk 9:19.[39]

Addition of final -ν: Jn 8:21.[40]

Omission of final -ν: Lk 14:32b; Jn 3:27.[41]

Addition of σ before τ: Lk 8:32.[42]

Omission of final -ς: Lk 7:24.[43]

-ν for -ς: Lk 17:5.[44]

-ς for -ν: Jn 11:5.[45]

δ for θ: Lk 18:9.[46]

And there are 20 cases of vowel confusion:

ο for ω: Lk 12:58, 14:9, 16:8, 24:30.[47]

ω for ο: Jn 7:46.[48]

ο for α: Lk 8:18, 11:18.[49]

α for η: Lk 14:33.[50]

η for α: Lk 10:2.[51]

ε for ει: Lk 8:38.[52]

ει for ε: Jn 7:32.[53]

ευ for ε: Lk 12:55.[54]

α for αι: Lk 23:29b.[55]

Loss of α: Lk 9:42b.[56]

Loss of ε: Lk 10:7; Jn 6:35.[57]

Addition of ι: Jn 11:29.[58]

α for ε: Lk 24:50; Jn 4:35, 7:49.[59]

And finally there are two cases of confusion concerning the line over a _nomen sacrum_:[60]

Line omitted: Lk 23:33.[61]

Line falsely added: Jn 3:8a.[62]

Nonsense Readings.--Martini has given a list of the "errori palesi" in the Lukan portion of P^{75}, and has provided a classification of these and some comments on several of them.[63] However, it is to be noted that Martini includes errors which have been corrected as well as a number of readings which I have taken to be merely orthographic. Colwell, on the other hand, counted 257 singular readings in P^{75} (i.e., before correction), of which 67 were deemed by him to be nonsense.[64] Elsewhere Colwell reports that P^{75} has 93 nonsense readings before correction, and 60 after correction.[65] Finally, Fee refers to "the presence of at least seventy-six uncorrected nonsense readings" in P^{75}, and says that "almost as many have been corrected."[66] These figures, as diverse as they are, confirm Martini's observation on "la frequenza degli scambi."[67]

According to my count, P^{75} has 7 readings which are strictly nonsense: Lk 9:10, 12:11b, 12:46; Jn 1:10, 2:6a, 4:5, 7:35a. Lk 12:11b is a dittography; note that at Lk 12:11a a similar error has accidentally produced a sensical word. Jn 2:6a and 7:35a omit ου from ιουδαιοι (-ων). And at Jn 4:5 we seem to have another dittography, although the original reading is unclear here. Lk 12:46 involves the substitution of one letter, and Lk 9:10 arises by a leap within a word. These errors confirm Colwell's view that the scribe of P^{75} copies (at least usually) letter by letter, or at any rate syllable by syllable.[68]

The remaining strictly nonsense reading is Jn 1:10. This is a curious reading, and the editors comment: "η et ε, si quidem recte leguntur, quid significent nescimus." Aland cites the reading as ηηεν and adds a question mark.[69] Subsequently, Schedl has suggested that the added letters may be a use of "urchristliche Symbolik,"[70] although it is strange that the scribe adds such symbolism within the text itself.

Twenty-seven further singulars are nonsense in context, and in most cases we have confusions involving only one or two letters, often as the result of the context. These readings are: Lk 6:14, 8:13, 9:52, 11:11b, 11:19, 11:39b, 11:53, 12:11a (a dittography), 13:16 (the correction was not completed), 14:29, 17:4, 18:11, 23:12b, 23:18, 23:25, 23:29a, 24:5, 24:18 (the correction was not completed); Jn 1:19, 2:6b, 2:6c, 2:16, 5:15, 10:29, 11:11, 14:25, 14:28.

Five of these result from the scribe's tendency to write the singular form of a verb instead of the plural: Lk 8:13, 9:52, 23:12b, 23:29a; Jn 1:19. It is true that, as Martini says: "Sono tutti casi in cui il soggetto segue il verbo o è sottinteso."[71] For some reason the scribe seems to have preferred the singular form, and when the subject had not already occurred wrote the singular in several cases where a further look would have made it evident that the plural was required.[72]

One of these cases of readings which are nonsense in context was referred to by Colwell, who says that at Lk 11:39b the scribe changed "the genitive (υμων) to the dative (υμιν) after the εν of εσωθεν."[73] There are several other cases where the immediate context has misled the scribe into writing something which is in fact nonsense, and it is interesting that the influence is often from what comes *after* the word which he is copying. These readings are: Lk 6:14 (αυτ*ου* follows), 11:19 (*εκ*βαλλουσιν follows), 23:18 (αυτον in vs. 16),[74] 23:25 (τ*ην* φυλακ*ην* precedes);[75] Jn 2:16 (εμπορι*ου* follows),[76] 5:15 (ιησ*ους* follows), 10:29 (*μοι* follows), 11:11 (? *η*μων follows),[77] 14:25 (μεν*ων* follows), 14:28 (προς υμας in vs. 28a).

The 7 strictly nonsense readings are 3.7% of the singulars, and the 27 nonsense in context readings are 14.1% of the singulars. The total of 34 nonsense readings form 17.8% of the singulars, by far the greatest percentage among our six papyri. Indeed, P^{75}'s percentage is a little more than twice as great as that of P^{72} or P^{46}, its nearest rivals. The even larger figures cited by Colwell and Fee arise, it appears, from their including as nonsense readings some (or even many) of the readings here counted as orthographic.

While the frequency of nonsense shows clearly that the scribe of P^{75} is subject to "carelessness or perhaps fatigue,"[78] there is a positive side to the high figure. For, just as the low frequency of nonsense in P^{45} shows that that scribe was consciously producing new readings, so the high frequency of nonsense in P^{75} shows that this scribe was (at least usually) simply blundering. Colwell's comment is to the point:

> Another way of saying this is that when the scribe of P^{45} creates a singular reading, it almost always makes sense; when the scribes of P^{66} and P^{75} create singular readings, they frequently do not make sense and are obvious errors. Thus P^{45} must be given credit for a much greater density of intentional changes than the other two.[79]

Martini similarly remarks that "P^{75} non è un testo innovatore."[80] Indeed, the obviousness of so many of the mistakes of P^{75} would make it easy for a later scribe to correct them, while the innovations of P^{45} would often be comparatively difficult to detect.

Corrections.--There are 116 corrections in P^{75}, the list of which may be found in Appendix A. Almost all of the corrections are certainly by the scribe himself, and I have counted 13 instances where the scribe's work is unmistakable.[81] However, there are 5 corrections which appear to be by later hands. The corrector whom I call "man 2" seems to have made the corrections at Lk 11:31, 17:14a, and Jn

5:5.[82] And another corrector, whom I call "man 3," has added some illegible letters at Lk 11:34b and Jn 11:41.[83] There are also three marginal additions which seem to have no relation to the text, and are ignored here.[84]

Considering the 111 corrections which are certainly or probably by the scribe,[85] we see that most of them are of obvious scribal blunders, and in most cases to the reading found in B.[86] Indeed, where the correction is not to the reading found in B, we almost always have merely an itacistic variant or a correction to the reading found in the majority of manuscripts. The only exceptions to this rule are Jn 3:16 (where only Ψ 083 support the correction) and Jn 8:19b (where only T Or^{pt} support the correction), as well as those eleven readings where the correction has introduced a singular: Lk 10:31, 13:16, 18:9, 23:6, 24:18; Jn 1:10, 1:34, 2:4, 4:5a, 8:19a, 12:36b. These data suggest that there was no attempt to revise the text by a second exemplar, and indeed no systematic correction at all.[87]

The quantity of corrections is nevertheless large enough that Martin and Kasser's characterization of them as "peu fréquentes" is rather misleading.[88] It is true, of course, that the 116 corrections in P^{75} are far fewer than the 440 found in P^{66} (with considerably less text). And Martini utilizes this comparison to justify his claim: "Le correzioni in Bodmer XIV non sono molto numerose."[89] But what then are we to make of the fact that P^{45}, with perhaps half the text of P^{75}, has only 11 corrections? It does seem that P^{75} has a fairly low rate of correction, but its rate is clearly not the lowest of the early papyri, even if its rate is lower than that of the papyrus which is most extensively corrected.

Accuracy and Copying Technique.--A number of scholars have commented on the general accuracy of the scribe of P^{75}, and Colwell saw him as working within a "controlled tradition,"[90] and feeling "the obligation to make an exact copy."[91] Such scholars have pointed both to the comparatively small number of singulars (and scribal blunders of various types) and to the nature of the scribe's errors as evidence for this care in copying.[92] Fee indeed says flatly: "In comparison with any of the other early papyri, this scribe produced a remarkably error-free copy."[93]

A closer look, though, at the evidence shows that here too the characterization of the scribe of P^{75} is at least partially misleading. For example, Fee compares the number of singulars in P^{75} with those in P^{66}, of which he counts 482 including over 200 nonsense readings.[94] Fee then notes: "Granted that such readings are frequently corrected, they nevertheless demonstrate the basic inefficiency of the scribe [of P^{66}]."[95] The judgment here on P^{66} has been adequately discussed in Chapter V; using Fee's terms, we may note here simply that inefficiency is not the same as inaccuracy, and that P^{66}'s zealousness in correcting his blunders shows clearly that he too feels "the obligation to make an exact copy."

But let us turn to the textual data. If we use Colwell's figures on the amounts of text, we see that P^{75} has 1.9 (191/102) singulars per page, and 1.2 (119/102) significant singulars per page. On the other hand, P^{66} has .9 (129/148) singular per page, and .7 (107/148) significant singular per page. However, the pages of P^{66} do contain less material than do those of P^{75}, so let us consider the ratios calculated on the basis of the verses. We find then that P^{75} has .14 (191/1406) singular per verse, and .08 (119/1406) significant singular per verse. Likewise, P^{66} has .16 (129/808) singular per verse, and .13 (107/808) significant singular per verse. Given the uncertainties involved in such calculations, perhaps all we can say is that P^{75} does make errors somewhat less frequently than does P^{66}. When we turn to the significant singulars only, P^{66} clearly makes more, since P^{75} has many more orthographic and nonsense singulars. In terms, though, of the total number of singulars created, there appears to be no great contrast between P^{66} and P^{75}.

Martini approaches the comparison from a different point of view, and includes P^{45} and P^{46}, as well as P^{66}. First he considers the Lukan portion of P^{45}, whose "errori palesi" amount to "11, di cui uno corretto."[96] For a comparable amount of text, Martini judges that P^{75} would have "circa 16 errori."[97] So P^{45} comes out significantly better here, although Martini rightly emphasizes that the fragmentary nature of P^{45} results in an under-estimation of the frequency of its errors. Consequently, "un giudizio sul rapporto tra quantità di testo e numero di errori in questa parte di P^{45} non può essere definitivo."[98]

Martini next compares the frequency of error by P^{46} in Galatians with that of P^{75} in Luke. In Galatians Martini counts "circa 15 errori palesi" in P^{46}. Considering four comparable blocks of material in the Lukan part of P^{75}, Martini finds, respectively: 22 errors, of which 6 are corrected; 13 errors, of which 1 is corrected; 13 errors, of which 5 are corrected; and 18 errors, of which 6 are corrected.[99] The resulting uncorrected errors (16, 12, 8, and 12) occur, thus, somewhat less frequently on the average than do the errors in P^{46}. But Martini merely concludes: "Appare dunque che la proporzione di errori è abbastanza costante in P^{75}, e corrisponde all'incirca alla media dello scriba di P^{46} in Galati."[100]

UMI

Martini finally turns to P^{66}, and it is here that the emphasis on that scribe's errors prior to correction most affects the comparison. Martini says: "Ciò che colpisce in P^{66} è il grande aumento della percentuale di errori."[101] For an exact analysis Martini chooses P^{66}'s text of Jn 1:1 - 4:28, which is of a length comparable to that of the other sections considered earlier for P^{75} and the other two papyri. For this portion of P^{66} Martini counts the errors as "circa 33, di cui 27 corretti."[102] The drastic difference between the number of errors prior to correction and the number after correction leads to a drastic difference in evaluation of P^{66}'s accuracy. In fact, given Martini's figures here, it is clear that P^{66} after correction would rank as the most accurate of the four papyri Martini considers. On the basis, though, of our earlier calculations, it is likely that Martini has taken a misleading sample of text from P^{66}, and that P^{66}'s rate of error after correction is higher than it appears from this one piece of evidence. But, in any case, Martini's evidence does not show that P^{75} is more accurate than is P^{66}, provided that we look at the full picture of P^{66}'s scribal activity and do not arbitrarily isolate only the first portion of his work.

Martini's general conclusion is:

> Da tali paragoni risalta che lo scriba di Bodmer XIV non è al di sotto della media dei suoi contemporanei, anzi sembra aver compiuto il suo lavoro fin dall'inizio con una attenzione superiore a quella dello scriba di P^{66}, e dà l'impressione di possedere nel complesso una formazione preferibile a quella dello scriba di P^{46}.[103]

As we have seen, though, the evidence for the comparison with P^{66} is not really furnished by Martini, and the comment on the "formazione" of P^{46} seems unrelated to the rates of error calculated by Martini. What we should, I believe, conclude is that P^{75} does achieve a laudable level of accuracy, but does not appear greatly different from these other papyri. However, a more thorough analysis of the nature of the errors committed by the scribe of P^{75} will aid in reaching a judgment, and it is to this analysis of the 119 significant singulars in P^{75} that we now turn.

Additions.--Twelve (10.1%) of the significant singulars are additions. This is the second lowest percentage among our six papyri (only slightly higher than P^{47}), and indicates that the scribe of P^{75} takes few conscious liberties with the text. For presumably an addition (and particularly a sensical addition) requires some conscious activity which may be absent in an omission.

All but one of the additions are of one word, and these may be classified thusly:

a) Conjunctions (3 cases): Lk 9:48b (δε); Jn 11:31a (και), 14:9 (και).

b) Pronouns (3 cases): Jn 6:5a (εαυτοις), 6:57 (μου), 8:55 (υμιν).

c) Articles (3 cases): Jn 2:1 (τη),[104] 6:32 (τον),[105] 10:12 (τα).

d) Verb (1 case): Lk 6:23 (εστι).[106]

e) Adverb (1 case): Jn 6:50 (ου).[107]

Three of these are harmonizations to the context (Jn 8:55, 10:12, 14:9), one is a harmonization to parallels (Jn 6:5a), and one is a harmonization to general usage (Jn 6:57). The other additions appear to arise from attempts to improve the style or grammar.

The only sensical addition of more than one word[108] is Lk 16:22a. Kilpatrick argues with respect to P^{75}'s εν τω there:

> The difference in sense is slight and the usual Greek text has a more regular construction, though there are enough parallels in Luke to the reading of P^{75}. In view of this it seems more likely that the usual reading is a correction and the reading of P^{75} is original.[109]

Martini is more hesitant, but does include this reading among the four singulars of P^{75} in Luke[110] which he thinks have a claim to originality, and comments:

> anche qui il versetto è tormentato nella tradizione testuale: la lezione di P^{75} sembra legare fortemente il complesso della frase, subordinando le due morti e dando così compattezza al racconto.[111]

However, as Martini hints, the clarity introduced by P^{75}'s addition may well just be what would motivate a scribe to make such an addition. Similarly, the fact that the addition conforms to Lukan style, as Kilpatrick notes, may just mean that the scribe has conformed what Luke wrote here to what Luke often wrote elsewhere.[112] Since, as we shall see, the scribe of P^{75} does frequently harmonize his text to the context, parallels, or general usage, it seems most likely that Lk 16:22a is also an example of this tendency, and thus it should be counted as another case of harmonization to usage (in fact, to Lukan style).

These 12 additions increase the text by 13 words, for an average of 1.1 words per addition.

Omissions.--Forty-one (34.5%) of the significant singulars are omissions. Thirty-four of these are of one word, and may be classified as follows:

a) Articles (12 cases):[113] Lk 3:22 (before πνευμα), 9:1 (before δαιμονια),[114] 10:39 (before ιησου),[115] 11:11a (before πατερα),[116] 13:1b (before θυσιων), 15:18 (before ουρανον),[117] 22:55 (before πετρος),[118] 24:28 (before κωμην); Jn 5:30 (before εμη), 7:33a (before ιησους),[119] 11:13a (before θανατου), 14:22 (before ισκαριωτης).

b) Pronouns (9 cases):[120] Lk 8:22 (αυτος), 9:9 (ουτος), 9:34 (αυτους),[121] 11:27 (ταυτα), 11:46 (υμων), 12:31 (αυτου),[122] 13:1a (αυτω); Jn 5:12 (αυτον),[123] 10:17 (μου).

c) Conjunctions (9 cases): Lk 9:42a (δε), 13:14 (δε), 14:21 (και), 14:26 (τε),[124] 15:30 (δε),[125] 22:24 (δε), 23:11 (και); Jn 6:39a (δε), 7:12a (οτι recitativum).[126]

d) Verbs (2 cases): Jn 7:17 (ποιειν),[127] 9:8 (εστιν).

e) Nouns (2 cases): Lk 11:31a (νοτου),[128] Jn 5:25 (ωρα).[129]

The comparative rarity of omission of verbs and nouns is doubtless related to the fact that such omission would in general materially affect the sense (or even give nonsense), while the omission of articles and pronouns often does not greatly alter the meaning, and the omission of conjunctions creates nothing worse than asyndeton. In fact, there are also 7 singular omissions of more than one word, and in each case P^{75} has a sensical text: Lk 13:34 (6 words, perhaps one line in the Vorlage),[130] 14:8a (2 words),[131] 15:12 (2 words);[132] Jn 4:37 (16 words),[133] 4:47 (2 words),[134] 7:18 (2 words),[135] 12:38 (2 words).[136]

Colwell says of the scribe of P^{75}:

> A half dozen times he chooses brevity, possibly for style. . . . One of his habits is to omit personal pronouns; he drops more than a dozen and adds one. This could be stylistic, but is probably related to the occasional carelessness of P^{75} in regard to short words.[137]

Whether carelessly or intentionally, the scribe clearly tends to shorten his text. Note, though, that Colwell's figures with respect to pronouns must be revised: my count gives the ratio as 9 omissions to 3 additions.[138] So the scribe's habit is still toward omission, but not as markedly as Colwell says.

These 41 omissions cause the loss of 66 words, at an average of 1.6 words per omission. The omissions are thus usually longer than are the additions. And the additions and omissions together result in the loss of 53 words from the scribe's *Vorlage*.

Transpositions.--Eleven (9.2%) of the significant singulars are transpositions, and they tend to involve short blocks of text (only one of more than three words):[139]

2 words (6 cases): Lk 7:6, 14:10 (corrected leap: εσται σοι δοξα), 14:28b; Jn 7:23, 8:17,[140] 14:19.

3 words (4 cases): Jn 4:54 (corrected leap: παλιν δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν),[141] 5:34, 6:1, 10:32 (corrected leap: πολλα εργα εδειξα υμιν καλα).[142]

7 words (1 case): Lk 24:27 (corrected leap: αυτοις εν πασαις ταις γραφαις τα περι εαυτου).[143]

P^{75} thus ranks far behind P^{45} and P^{66} in its frequency of transpositions, far ahead of P^{47}, and about the same as P^{46} and P^{72}. By the way, the scribe corrects transpositions (both singular) only twice: Jn 1:18,[144] 8:18.[145]

Since P[75] shows a tendency to omit words and shorts phrases even when a leap is not involved, at least some of these transpositions may have arisen from the "correction" of such omissions. Moreover, although the leaps postulated here involve only one or two letters and thus might be thought to be improbable, it must be remembered that P[75] tends to copy letter by letter (or syllable by syllable). Consequently, such leaps would be more likely than for a scribe who copies by words or phrases.

Harmonizations.--Five (4.2%) of the significant singulars may have arisen through assimilation to remote parallels, although two of these cases are doubtful.[146] These readings are: Lk 3:22 (? parallel to Mt 3:16 א B),[147] 8:21 (parallel to Mt 12:48),[148] 12:31 (? parallel to Mt 6:33 א (B)); Jn 6:5a (parallel to Mt 14:15 and Mk 6:36),[149] 6:5b (parallel to Mt 14:15 and Mk 6:36).[150]

Although much of P[75] contains texts without close parallels, one may still say that our scribe is relatively free from such influence.[151]

There appear to be only 2 (1.7%) of the significant singulars which are cases of harmonization to general usage: Lk 16:22a (gives the construction εγενετο εν τω plus infinitive);[152] Jn 6:57 (gives τον πατερα μου).[153]

As with the other papyri, most of the harmonizations in P^{75} are harmonizations to the context.[154] Indeed, among the significant singulars I have counted 18 cases. It is interesting that only 4 of these occur in Luke, which contains somewhat more than half the singulars. John obviously gave our scribe more tempting occasions for making this type of mistake.[155]

These 18 harmonizations to the context are: Lk 9:48a (two subjunctives of this verb in vs. 48),[156] 11:32 ("greater" refers to Jesus, and so is masculine),[157] 16:27 (ουν in vs. 27b), 16:30 (the discussion is of being raised from the dead);[158] Jn 4:14 (αλλο modifies το υδωρ),[159] 4:17 (λεγει in vss. 15, 16, 17b), 4:18 (ειπας in vs. 17b), 5:13 (ο δε in vs. 13a), 6:17 (εγεγονει in vs. 17a), 6:19 (επι την θαλασσαν in vs. 16),[160] 8:38 (λαλω in vs. 38a),[161] 8:55 (υμιν in vss. 51, 55, 58), 10:7 (ποιμην in vss. 2, 11a, 11b, 14),[162] 10:12 (τα ιδια in vss. 3, 4), 11:12 (the resurrection of Lazarus is the context),[163] 14:9 (και τον πατερα in vs. 7), 14:21 (τηρων in vs. 21a),[164] 14:27 (ηκουσατε in vs. 28).

The overall pattern of these 25 harmonizations is:

		119 sign. singulars	25 harmonizations
18	to context	15.1%	72.0%
5	to parallels	4.2%	20.0%
2	to usage	1.7%	8.0%
25	harmonizations	21.0%	

And the following table indicates what sorts of errors are created by the three types of harmonization:

	Replacement	Addition	Omission
18 to context	15(83.3%)	3(16.7%)	0
5 to parallels	2(40.0%)	1(20.0%)	2(40.0%)
2 to usage	0	2(100 %)	0
25 harmonizations	17(68.0%)	6(24.0%)	2(8.0%)

The ratio of replacements and additions is about the same as for the other papyri; the absence of transpositions doubtless reflects the comparatively small number of such singulars generally.

Grammatical Changes.--Nine of the singulars arise from the interchange of various grammatical forms. At Jn 12:24 P^{75} has αν for εαν,[165] at Lk 9:24 has εινεκεν for ενεκεν,[166] and at Lk 14:34 has both αλας and αλα.[167] There are two confusions of aorist forms: -αν for -ον at Lk 10:30,[168] -ες for -ας at Jn 3:8b.[169] Twice P^{75} adds an augment to a participle:[170] Lk 14:1 and Jn 1:40. And once the augment is omitted:[171] Lk 14:25a. And there is also the reading at Lk 6:48b, where P^{75} apparently augments the infinitive.[172]

I have noted the following shifts in the forms of verbs which seem to betray no particular pattern:

Present to future: Lk 11:23.[173]

Aorist to present: Jn 7:33b,[174] 8:24.

Imperfect to perfect: Lk 24:21.[175]

Imperfect to aorist: Lk 23:8; Jn 6:18.

Perfect to aorist: Jn 6:39b.[176]

Indicative to subjunctive: Lk 9:48a.[177]

Future to aorist imperative: Jn 7:34.[178]

Infinitive to indicative:[179] Lk 14:28a.

First person to third person: Jn 6:5b.[180]

Third singular to second plural: Jn 14:27.[181]

A number of the singulars involve conjunctions. We have already seen that three conjunctions are added and nine are omitted among the singulars. There are seven further cases of substitution of one conjunction for another:

τε for δε: Lk 11:39a, 12:28.[182]

ουν for δε: Lk 16:27 (harmonization to context).

δε for γαρ: Jn 5:13 (harmonization to context).

οτε for οτι: Lk 11:42.[183]

ουδε for ουτε: Jn 8:19.[184]

και for δε: Lk 5:1.

Kilpatrick has argued that P^{75} preserves the original reading at this last text,[185] but his grounds seem not to be confirmed for the scribal tendencies of P^{75} at least.

For Kilpatrick claims: "In general the tendency was to substitute δέ for καί. καί was increasingly overworked; δέ was the more elegant expression."[186] However, the singulars of P^{75} which involve conjunctions apart from Lk 5:1 do not show such a tendency. There are three cases of a shift from δε to some other conjunction, and there is no case of a shift from και.

Furthermore, if we look at the singular additions and omissions, we find a tendency opposite to that which Kilpatrick postulates. Twice P^{75} adds και, but only once δε. And five times P^{75} omits δε, but only twice και. Unless we are to suppose that many or most of these singulars are not really creations by the scribe, we can only conclude that the scribe of P^{75} (at least) tended away from δε, and tended toward και. The singular at Lk 5:1 then becomes just one more example of an established scribal tendency, and there is no reason to suspect the majority text.

At Lk 15:17 the scribe has construed περισσευω with the dative instead of the genitive. This is a possible reading,[187] although the reason for the change is not evident. We may also mention here the reading at Jn 6:18, where the text of P^{75} is not clear. We probably have here some confusion of verbal forms,[188] or perhaps nothing more than the replacement of ε by α.

Finally, we may look at Jn 4:41, where P^{75} reads πλειον in place of πλειους. Kilpatrick has argued that P^{75} is correct here,[189] and that the majority reading is the result of Atticistic "correction." He says of the various comparative forms of πολυς: "The contracted forms seem to be a mark of Atticism."[190]

It is, however, unclear why this consideration should be relevant to P^{75}'s reading. What Kilpatrick supposes is that scribes changed the neuter singular πλειον to the masculine plural πλειους, the contracted form. Such a shift is not at all warranted by Kilpatrick's reconstruction of Moeris' principle, according to which the Atticists preferred πλειν and πλειους, while the Hellenists preferred πλειον and πλεονες. One would then imagine that an Atticist corrector of P^{75}'s reading would change it to πλειν, but would not alter both gender and number.[191]

Kilpatrick, though, presents two supplementary considerations. The first refers to the variation at Jn 21:15, where πλειον (or πλεον) τουτων is omitted by f^{1} 22 565 660 it$^{a,aur,b,c,e,ff^{2},r^{1}}$ syr^{s}.[192] Kilpatrick says: "This [omission] may suggest that expressions with πλεῖον (πλέον) sometimes gave offence in Antiquity."[193] However, I suspect that there is a much more straightforward explanation for the omission: scribes have harmonized vs. 15 to vs. 16, where Jesus asks simply, αγαπας με.[194] Alternatively, we may suppose that the difficulty in understanding the clause led to its deletion.[195] In either case, the form πλειον (πλεον) would be irrelevant.

Kilpatrick's second consideration is the following:

> πλέον in old Greek had the meaning plus, not magis, but steadily encroached on μᾶλλον until it came to be used with positive adjectives to from a comparative. Atticists may by reaction have been hypersensitive and have tried to eliminate the word even where it was properly used.[196]

One may, of course, imagine scribes to be capable of anything, but this explanation seems strained. In fact, Kilpatrick's position that P^{75} has preserved the authentic text would appear to require that at least several scribes would make this same "correction" independently. For, *ex hypothesi* πλειον stood in the common ancestor of P^{75} and B. Obviously, one scribe must have introduced πλειους within the tradition from this ancestor to B. But it seems extremely unlikely that all our extant Greek manuscripts except P^{75} could have inherited this reading from that single scribe's manuscript. If this is so, though, we must imagine that more than one scribe would have happened upon πλειους as a substitute for πλειον (instead, say, of just omitting the offensive word), or that, through contamination in the tradition, πλειους eventually replaced all the other readings, which then disappeared without a trace in the Greek tradition. Neither supposition seems as probable as that P^{75} has simply erred.

It must be noted, though, that Kilpatrick calls attention to the support from it^{e,r1} for P^{75}'s πλειον. But the Latin witnesses present a number of divergences at Jn 4:41:[197]

multo plures	it$^{aur,b,c,d,f,ff^2,l}$ vg^{rell}
multo plus	it^{r1}
multo amplius	it^{e}
multi	it^{q}
multi plures	vg^{D}
multos plures	vg^{R}

The conclusion to be drawn from this diversity is that various scribes seem to have been puzzled by John's πολλω πλειους (or the Latin rendering multo plures), and altered it in different ways.

Proper Name.--The one singular in P^{75} which involves a proper name, Lk 16:19, has received more attention than any other.[198] There was initial agreement on the view that the reading of P^{75} was related to the Sahidic version, which corresponds to the Greek: πλουσιος ονοματι νινευη(ς).[199] And in fact the reading of P^{75} would seem to have arisen from such a Greek reading by haplography based on a leap: ONOMATININEYHΣ.[200] The origin of the name νινευη(ς) has now been explained by Grobel as a combination in Coptic which means "Nobody,"[201] and occurs in a Demotic story with some relation to the story of Lazarus in Lk 16:19-31. Grobel goes on to explain:

> How are we to assume this old folk-jest got into the Sahidic version? We must postulate a Sahidic scribe who had lived in the Oasis of Fayyum and was familiar with its dialect and its folk-tales. There, a mere thirty miles from Memphis, where the Satme-form of the tale is firmly localized, he heard an oral version of the story which contained the names pronounced in the local dialect. Later, when he was copying Luke, he was so struck by the closeness of the two stories that he could not resist putting down, perhaps only in the margin: 'his name was ⲚⲒⲚⲈⲨⲈ.' Papyrus 75 is dependent upon this. The scribe of the Greek papyrus, perhaps an immigrant Christian whose Greek was as yet better than his Coptic, shortened[1] [note 1: Perhaps by simple haplography: ⲞⲚⲞⲘⲀⲦⲒⲚⲒⲚⲈⲨⲎⲤ --after writing the first ⲒⲚ his eye jumped over the second ⲒⲚ.] the name, gave it a Greek declensional ending, and wrote ⲚⲈⲨⲎⲤ. The name Finees or Finaeus [both of which occur in later writings] I take to be dependent upon this pseudo-Greek form ⲚⲈⲨⲎⲤ: it is the same name augmented by the Bohairic article ⲫ.[202]

Grobel's theory seems to account adequately for the reading of P^{75}; a leap within the Coptic text itself would be less likely (being only from one Ⲛ to the next), and we have already seen that the scribe of P^{75} makes a fair number of scribal leaps.

Martini has some valuable observations on the forms of proper names within P^{75}, but these further cases do not involve singular readings.[203]

Miscellaneous Substitutions.--There are a few special cases of substitution which may be briefly noted. At Lk 10:31 P^{75} has corrected ϰατα συγϰυρειαν to ϰατα συγτυχειαν (for συντυχιαν). Martini comments on this reading:

> La lezione del correttore in 10,31, che finora non ricorreva nel N.T. ed è di per sé più classica della alternativa, sembra dovuta a una emendazione riflessa, del genere di quella operata da D allo stesso luogo.[204]

Indeed, Martin and Kasser had already noted that "συγϰυρία est un mot ionien assez rare alors que συντυχία est le terme classique usuel."[205] It is surprising, though, that the scribe (who made this correction, it seems[206]) would thus consciously introduce a word not found in the New Testament. The only motive for this replacement would seem to be the verb συντυχειν at Lk 8:19, which might have stayed in the scribe's mind.

Also, at Lk 13:25 P^{75} has replaced ο οιϰοδεσποτης by ο δεσποτης. This looks like nothing more than a leap within a word: ο οιϰοδεσποτης.[207] And at Jn 1:7 P^{75} has μαρτΰριον for μαρτυριαν. This may be only another ο/α confusion, although the fact that the scribe had probably copied εις μαρτυριον at Lk 21:13 a few folios earlier may have contributed to the shift.

Besides the several cases of substitutions of verbs due to the influence of the context, there is also the "substitution" of a form of γενναω for a form of γινομαι at Lk 10:13. Although both forms seem to make sense here, the scribe probably did not intend a difference, but simply doubled the consonant through a sound error.[208] There are also two cases of substitution of prepositions: the nonsensical Lk 11:19 (due to the context), and the sensical Jn 7:13, where we have a case of the fairly frequent interchange of περι and υπερ.[209]

Finally, there are several examples of singulars involving prepositional prefixes. At Lk 23:6 επ- is omitted,[210] while δια- is added at Lk 12:42.[211] And at Lk 10:1 ανα- is replaced by εν-.[212]

Summary.--The copying activity of the scribe of P^{75} is characterized by the following chief features.

I. The scribe makes a fair number of errors of orthography, and creates many nonsense readings, mostly involving simple slips of one or two letters. The frequent corrections by the scribe himself are generally of mere blunders. The overall impression is that the scribe copied with care, but not with the unusual care which has sometimes been ascribed to him.

II. The scribe has a low frequency of addition, and omits more than three times as often as he adds. Both additions and omissions are usually short, as are the rather few cases of transposition.

III. Harmonization accounts for quite a few of the singulars, with harmonization to the immediate context being by far the most common (and occurring mostly in John).

IV. There appears to be no clear tendency to make grammatical or stylistic improvements, although the scribe does tend to write the singular of verbs instead of the plural when the subject has not already been expressed (thus usually creating nonsense in context).

FOOTNOTES

[1] The editors date it to "entre 175 et 225" (Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser, eds., *Papyrus Bodmer XIV* [Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961], p. 13), while Aland assigns it to the beginning of the third century (*Repertorium*, p. 309). A date around 200 is safe, and makes P^{75} of about the same age as P^{66}.

[2] Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, pp. 11-12.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 9. Five of the folios were re-used for the binding.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 10.

[5] A few fragments could not be photographed (*ibid*., p. 5), and for these one must rely on the editors' transcription.

[6] *Ibid*., p. 5.

[7] The editors' comments in their introduction on the readings of P^{75} must similarly be checked; they often say "P seul" for a reading which does have support.

[8] Kurt Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," *New Testament Studies*, 11 (1964-65), pp. 1-21 (the collation is on pp. 5-21).

[9] *Ibid*., p. 4. It appears that Aland (and his colleagues, see p. 4 n. 1) utilized Tischendorf, von Soden, P^{45}, and P^{66}.

[10] At the following places I suppose a different reading of the papyrus from Aland's:

Lk 6:39: Martin and Kasser thought that P^{75} omitted (εμ)πεσουνται, and Martini follows them (*Il problema*, p. 153 [see also p. 140 and p. 184]). Aland questions this omission, and doesn't cite P^{75} at all here in the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland. In fact, I believe that it is quite likely that the last two lines on this page should be read thus:

τυφλοςτυφ[λο]νοδηγει[νουχιαμ
φο]τεροιειςβοθυ[νονπε]σου[νταιουκε

It is indeed easy to see that, were πεσουνται really absent, too much space would be taken up by the missing portion of βοθυνον.

Lk 6:46: The spaces involved suggest that lines 28-30 on this page should be read as beginning:

τος]καρδιας
τιδε]με
ειτ]εο

In fact, με is directly under αρ, and so there is room for τιδε under τοςκ. Aland is again following Martin and Kasser, and Martini also cites P^{75} as omitting δε (*Il problema*, p. 153 and p. 186). The reading, though, is not singular in any case.

Jn 1:34: I believe that και εγω is the most likely reading here for P^{75c}. Martin and Kasser (*Papyrus Bodmer XV* [Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961], p. 11) say simply: "Post κα vestigia imperfecta litterarum super lineam." Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," p. 14, suggests και πυρι or και πυρι εγω. The first, though, is impossible, since the -γω is clear in the next line, and the second must be rejected since the letter after και can hardly be a π.

At the following places, however, Aland is correct in his emendation of Martin and Kasser:

Lk 8:32: P^{75} probably has αυτοις.
Lk 17:31: P^{75} clearly has οπισσω.
Lk 22:21: P^{75} clearly has παραδιδοντος.
Lk 23:21: P^{75} probably has corrected λεγον to λεγοντες. Martini (*Il problema*, p. 162) cites the reading as Aland has it, but later (p. 171) calls it "molto incerto." The plate does suggest that *something* is added.
Jn 6:35: P^{75} probably has ερχομνος.
Jn 7:12: P^{75} probably omits οτι.
Jn 7:18: P^{75} clearly has την ιδιαν.
Jn 9:33: P^{75} probably has ουτος.
Jn 11:41: I accept Aland's explanation of these remains.

A few possible readings are too doubtful to cite: Jn 7:52 (where the editors and Aland read ο προφητης with

P^{66*}, but the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland cites P^{75vid} as omitting the article), and Jn 10:36 (where the editors read ο υιος with P^{45}; Nestle-Aland cites only P^{45} for the addition [and cf. Chapter II, note 16 above]).

Aland's references to other manuscripts are sometimes incorrect or inadequate. See, for instance, Lk 8:7, where 579 should be 472; 9:48b, where Aland says that και ος αν is read by ς rell; 9:60, where Aland cites P^{75} as singular even though it is supported by G X Γ al; and Jn 9:10, where the textual evidence for the correction is reversed.

The following singular readings are not noted by Aland in his collation because of their minor significance: Lk 6:48b, 9:24, 16:4, 16:8, 23:33 (Aland cites this on p. 2), 24:30; Jn 3:8a (Aland also cites this on p. 2), 7:46.

Finally, there are also the following points: At Lk 15:30 I assume that there are two variants, the omission of δε which P^{75} has alone, and the omission of ο which P^{75} shares with U; Aland combines these two, and fails to note the reading of U. At Jn 7:13 I suppose that P^{75} has υπερ; Aland cites υπ or υπερ; either would be singular. Also, I assume that at Lk 24:39 and Jn 1:35 the scribe has written κ, and not χ, so that P^{75} has the majority reading; see Martin and Kasser's comments in their apparatus, and *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 22. (Aland notes only Jn 1:35.) Further, I ignore the three marginal additions which seem to have no relation to the text; see *ibid*., p. 24, and Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," p. 4 n. 2.

[11] *Il problema*, "Lista 1," pp. 153-65.

[12] *Ibid*., "Lista 7," pp. 184-85, and "Lista 2," pp. 166-68.

[13] I checked my list of singulars for Luke against Martini's list 7 ("lezioni singolari"), and then checked further against his list 2 ("errori palesi"). Martini does not cite: 6:48b (this is discussed on p. 51), 9:1, 9:24, 11:31a, 12:31 (Martini follows von Soden in citing 892 for the omission [*Il problema*, p. 186], but 892 has αυτου), 12:42 (Martini [*ibid*., p. 186] cites "(118)" in support of

P^{75} here, and thus takes the reading to be sub-singular; the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland cited 118 as agreeing with P^{75}, but the 26th edition cites only "(pc)"), 14:8a (Martini [*ibid*., p. 187] takes this as sub-singular because of the support from it^b cop^{sa}), 14:26 (Martini [*ibid*.] cites this as sub-singular because of the support from it^{a,e,r^1}), 14:34, 16:19 (Martini [*ibid*.] takes this to be sub-singular because of cop^{sa}), and 18:11.

In his list of singular readings, Martini also has 6:39 (where the papyrus was probably misread; cf. note 10 above), 12:18 (where P^{75} has substantial support, as Martini elsewhere notes [*ibid*., p. 125]), 12:48 (where P^{75} is supported by $\aleph^*$), 23:2 (where P^{75} has in fact the majority reading), and 23:32 (which is just an itacism).

[14] *Ibid*., "Lista 4," pp. 170-72.

[15] Sarah Alexander Edwards, "P^{75} under the Magnifying Glass," *Novum Testamentum*, 18 (1976), pp. 190-212. It is unfortunate that Edwards appears rather unfamiliar with the literature on P^{75}, and as a consequence she cites two readings of P^{75} which had already been reported by Aland: 7:12a (Edwards, p. 206) and 7:18 (Edwards, p. 199). Edwards also confines herself to the textual data in Tischendorf and the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland (p. 197 n. 31), and does not even cite these with full accuracy. Note, for example, that on p. 196 she says that P^{75} is supported only by the "Didache" at Jn 2:24. In fact, her "Didache" comes from Tischendorf's "Did^{tri} 3,29," which is of course a reference to Didymus' *De trinitate*; and von Soden adds the support from 280 579.

[16] These ten readings are discussed by Edwards at, respectively, "P^{75}," p. 198 (in n. 32 "line 32" should be "line 23"), pp. 204-5, p. 203 (see p. 201 also; Edwards' textual references here are confused), p. 197 n. 30, p. 197 n. 30, pp. 199-200, p. 210, p. 210, p. 211, and p. 211. Incidentally, of the six readings noted by Edwards on p. 197 n. 30, two are itacisms (11:8 and 14:17), one involves a movable ν (9:30), one (12:36 [I believe that this must be the reference; Edwards has 12:31]) has been corrected, and the other two are genuine singulars.

[17] Edwards also proposes the following readings: Jn 6:21 επι την γην ("P^{75}," p. 205; this would be supported by $\aleph^*$ 063 f^{13} 28 579 1010 1424 pc, but in fact I believe

that what is visible may be only the two verticals of an H, rather than parts of HN), 6:36 (pp. 205-6, cited as 6:16; what Edwards takes to be the ο in πωποτε could be the ω, and this throws off the calculation), 10:29 (pp. 203-4; the presence of αυτα here seems likely, but is supported by f^{13} 245 arm pc [13 and 69 already in Tischendorf]), 11:30 (p. 206; supported by D), 11:37 (p. 199; Edwards thinks that Martin and Kasser read αυτω only, and she corrects to αυτων; but the editors have αυτω̅, which is what Edwards reports, the codex thus agreeing with the other manuscripts), 11:57 (pp. 206-7; P^{75} thus agrees with ς P^{66} A D L Θ Ψ f^{13} pm), 12:42 (p. 210; despite Edwards' claim I believe that there is a trace of a Ϲ present), 12:50 (p. 210; I am unable to confirm the reading, but from what Edwards reports it seems possible that the papyrus has ζωη/[εστι]ν [αιωνιος], thus agreeing with f^{13} 1170 1242).

[18] This relation was already noticed by Martin and Kasser (*Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 29): "il semble avoir surtout de l'affinité avec B." Further studies of a more systematic nature include: Calvin L. Porter, "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P^{75}) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 81 (1962), pp. 363-76; Colwell and Tune, "Quantitative Relationships," *Studies*, p. 60; Martini, *Il problema*, especially pp. 58-60 and pp. 66-85; and Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria," *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), pp. 24-28.

[19] Noted by Porter, "Papyrus," p. 374. The tables in Colwell and Tune, "Quantitative Relationships," *Studies*, p. 60; Martini, *Il problema*, p. 84; and Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," p. 25, confirm this close relation. In the study of Colwell and Tune only ς and Ω rank higher in agreements, while in Martini's study ς-Ω and P^{75}-B rank equally high. Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," p. 26, remarks that P^{75} and B have a relation to each other comparable to that existing among members of family 1, and in his *Papyrus*, p. 9 n. 2 (-p. 10), comments: "It seems curious to this writer that one may speak easily of a B ℵ text, as if this represented a textual monolith, yet feel that some sort of 'revision' transpired between the text of P^{75} and B, whose relationship is so close that ℵ is a distant cousin in comparison." The tables cited earlier bear out Fee's point.

[20] Within the sources cited in the preceding note, Colwell and Tune's table gives 92%, Martini's table gives 90%, and Fee's gives 94%.

[21] See Martini, *Il problema*, "Lista 6: Lezioni distintive P^{75}-B," pp. 181-83 (not all of these are read by P^{75} and B alone), and pp. 72-82.

[22] Martini, *ibid.*, pp. 62-65; note Martini's comparison (p. 65) of the relation between P^{75} and B with that between 174 and its copy 828. (It should be kept in mind, though, that the general level of accuracy in copying may well have been different in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and so the contrast may be misleading.) Both Martini (p. 63) and Colwell ("External Evidence," p. 6) call attention to the fact that B has not preserved the obvious errors of P^{75}, although Colwell uses this to argue that such readings are of no textual significance.

[23] Martini's *Il problema* is devoted to this issue, as is Fee's "*P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen*." Epp, "Interlude," p. 393, points out that the discovery of P^{75} does not show that the P^{75}-B type of text is not a recension (or revision, or whatever label one prefers); P^{75} shows merely (but significantly) that this type of text is, if a recension at all, a quite early recension. Fee accepts this qualification ("P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," p. 28), and proposes (following Hort and others) an internal examination to show that the P^{75}-B *type* of text is not a recension. However, this sort of analysis will necessarily not be affected at all by the discovery of P^{75}, since the readings were already known from B, and the *internal* considerations cannot be altered by the discovery of one more manuscript.

[24] Coptic support for a manuscript with the textual affinities of P^{75} would be natural. Indeed, the readings of Lk 16:19 and Jn 10:7 alone suggest a connection. Peter Weigandt, "Zum Text von Joh. X 7: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der koptischen Bibelübersetzung," *Novum Testamentum*, 9 (1967), pp. 47-48, calls attention to further Coptic support for P^{75}'s singulars. Kilpatrick, "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," pp. 39-40, also cites some Coptic support for readings of P^{66} and P^{75}, and comments: "These considerations are in favor of the suggestion that $P^{66,75}$ are just the kind of manuscripts from which the Coptic versions were made."

Martini, by the way, limits himself for the most

UMI

part to the evidence of the continuous-text Greek manuscripts in assessing P^{75} (*Il problema*, p. XIV), and, following the general principles outlined in Chapter I, I do the same.

[25] With respect to Lk 6:48, Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," p. 6, cites support for P^{75} from "D E H S^c Va [for V al]," thus ignoring that these witnesses have -ας instead of P^{75}'s -ης. Martini, *Il problema*, p. 51, p. 99, and p. 103, cites the variation here in three quite different ways, but (p. 99) seems to place W in support of P^{75}.

[26] Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," p. 10, cites Lk 14:18 as singular, as does Martini, *Il problema*, p. 49. In fact, since P^{75} often replaces a plural verb by a singular verb, this may well be an example of coincidental support.

[27] Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," p. 18, cites this reading as singular to P^{75}.

[28] I may note here a few readings which have been claimed to be singular by various writers, but which in fact find support. Calvin L. Porter, "An Analysis of the Textual Variation between Pap75 and Codex Vaticanus in the Text of John," *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament*, ed. Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, Studies and Documents, Vol. XXIX (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967), pp. 71-80, cites the following readings as singular which are not: Jn 3:31-32 (p. 72; this "reading" is created by combining several variations), 8:46 (p. 73; = 1241), 14:12 (p. 73; = H* Q), 11:31 (p. 74; = 33), and 12:8 (p. 74; = Λ* 892^{supp*}). Incidentally, since the last reading is an omission by homoeoteleuton which is corrected in two of the manuscripts, we may well have just a case of coincidence in error by three scribes. In any case, note that Λ* also omits by homoeoteleuton Jn 14:13b-14, and Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 406, says that the text of Λ is "praestantior et passim magna lectionis singularitate conspicuus." Similarly, von Soden, *Die Schriften*, *Untersuchungen*, p. 1177, says: "77 [Λ] ist besonders leichtfertig geschrieben. Es zeichnet sich aus durch zahlreiche, nur teilweise und zwar wohl schon vom Korrektor nachgetragene Omissionen."

Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 121, cites Jn 9:39 as singular, noting that this is just a harmonization to the context; by the way, on this reading see

Michael Mees, "Unterschiedliche Lesarten in Bodmer Papyrus XV (P^{75}) und Codex Vaticanus aus Joh. 1-9," *Augustinianum*, 9 (1969), p. 379.

Kilpatrick, "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," p. 43, includes among three "peculiar readings" of P^{75} the reading ου σπειρουσιν ουδε ϑεριζουσιν at Lk 12:24, which in fact is the reading of ς P^{45} A B W Θ Ψ f^1 f^{13} pm.

[29]"Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 110. Both Colwell (pp. 110-11) and Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, pp. 19-20, give some indications of the pattern of itacisms in P^{75}.

[30]*Il problema*, pp. 103-12.

[31]According to Colwell ("Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 110), P^{45} has 1.5 (90/60) itacisms per page, while P^{75} has .73 (145/199). But this gives P^{75} 199 pages, while only 51 folios are extant. If we thus utilize the figure of 102 pages, we find that P^{75} has 1.42 itacisms per page. Colwell's other estimate is on the basis of the number of verses, and here P^{45} has .11 itacism per verse (90/808), while P^{75} has .10 (145/1406). It is, however, true that P^{45} is often quite fragmentary, and moreover that Colwell apparently is counting uncorrected readings, and P^{75} has been much more extensively corrected than has P^{45}.

[32]See BDF, §17; Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 95; Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, pp. 16-17.

[33]A vowel in fact follows ου, and this was the cause of the scribeés error; see *ibid*., p. 23: "ici le copiste ne s'est pas avisé que la négation équivalait à une phrase, le verbe étant sous-entendu, et qu'une pause intervenait ensuite."

[34]See *ibid*., pp. 21-22.

[35]Cf. Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 159-60.

[36]*Ibid*., p. 158. Here this can be only an orthographic variation; but at Lk 10:13 we have two different verbs (which are frequently confused, of course).

[37]Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 155-56; BDF, 11(2).

[38]*Ibid*., p. 155; BDF, §11(2).

[39] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 118.

[40] *Ibid*., p. 113 (before a vowel).

[41] *Ibid*., p. 112 (both cases before a vowel).

[42] *Ibid*., p. 131.

[43] *Ibid*., pp. 124-25.

[44] *Ibid*., p. 132.

[45] *Ibid*.

[46] *Ibid*., p. 96. Cf. also Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.* Note that the correction is made here as in Lk 23:47 and Jn 5:45: the original letter is left intact and the corrector's letter is simply placed over it. I do not believe that the editors are justified in saying (*Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 22) that the result is "comme si le scribe laissait au lecteur le choix entre les deux orthographes" at Lk 18:9.

[47] Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 276-77. Note also the examples cited by Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 20, who also refer to the correction at Lk 23:35.

[48] Gignac, *Grammar*, p. 277.

[49] *Ibid*., pp. 286-87.

[50] *Ibid*., p. 286. This interchange is said to be "sporadic."

[51] *Ibid*., p. 286. No example of this direction of the shift is given.

[52] *Ibid*., p. 259 (under "other positions" Gignac gives one example before τ, as is Lk 8:38).

[53] *Ibid*., p. 257 (Jn 7:32 is again an example of the shift before τ, of which Gignac gives one example under "other positions").

[54] *Ibid*., p. 229.

[55] *Ibid*., p. 194.

[56] *Ibid.*, pp. 304-5. Of course, this could well be viewed as just a nonsense reading.

[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 306-9 (both cases are of loss between consonants).

[58] *Ibid.*, pp. 310-11; note that ι is the usual vowel which is added, and that Gignac (p. 311) cites εκχιειται for εκχειται, giving a close parallel to Jn 11:29's ηρχιετο for ηρχετο.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 283 (in unaccented syllables). Martini, *Il problema*, p. 50, relates these three readings (απαραϲ, απαρατε, απαρατοι) to each other, as do Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 21, who suggest that the readings are either "simples erreurs" or "phénomènes phonétiques."

[60] See Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 18, and Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," pp. 1-3.

[61] Cf. P^{72}'s error at 1 Pe 5:6.

[62] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 115, views this error as due simply to a confusion of similar forms. But Marchant A. King, "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 122 (1965), p. 240, correctly ascribes the error to the influence of the preceding π̅ν̅α̅.

[63] *Il problema*, "Lista 2," pp. 166-68, and pp. 47-54.

[64] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, pp. 111-12. The figure of 67 is not given by Colwell, but is found by subtracting the 190 sensible singulars from the 257 singulars.

[65] "External Evidence," p. 6.

[66] "p^{75}, p^{66}, and Origen," p. 32.

[67] *Il problema*, p. 53.

[68] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 116. See also Martini, *Il problema*, p. 53, who says that the "errori palesi" usually involve only one or two letters.

[69] "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," p. 14.

[70] Claus Schedl, "Zur Schreibung von Joh I 10A in Papyrus Bodmer XV," *Novum Testamentum*, 14 (1972), pp. 238-40 (citation from p. 240).

[71] The tendency is noted by Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 25, and by Martini, *Il problema*, pp. 48-49 (quotation from p. 48). Martini (*ibid*., and p. 53) also cites Lk 14:18 and 23:12a, which are in our list with support, Lk 15:24, where Tischendorf cites Π* pc in support, and Lk 11:53, which has been corrected by the scribe, as Martin and Kasser already note. Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," p. 32, also refers to Lk 15:24, but cites it as "11:24."

[72] One time the scribe did correct his mistake: Lk 11:53 (see the previous note).

[73] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 113.

[74] See Martini, *Il problema*, pp. 126-27: "E' probabile una origine trascrizionale della lezione: nella riga immediatamente precedente del papiro si trovano proprio sopra alla nostra lezione le parole παιδευσας ουν αυτον che possono aver indotto a scrivere un secondo αυτον."

[75] Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 21, cite this in the same category.

[76] It is also the case that μου precedes, but this would, I suppose, be read with του πατρος.

[77] Note that, in fact, (φιλ)οςη(μων) follows, and the scribe has written the same combination earlier: (λαζαρ)οςη. Perhaps a leap occurred, was caught, but was not corrected. And it is perhaps also possible that the scribe took η as the verb.

[78] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 115.

[79] *Ibid*., p. 112.

[80] *Il problema*, p. 140.

[81] These are: Lk 9:22, 12:53, 16:21, 17:27, 24:18, 24:26; Jn 3:11, 4:5b, 4:42, 6:54, 8:18, 11:3, 12:31. Eight of these appear to have been made during the course of the copying: Lk 16:21, 17:27; Jn 3:11, 4:42, 6:54, 8:18, 11:3, 12:31. Indeed, at Jn 12:31 the scribe caught himself in the middle of a leap omitting a syllable, and then wrote the correct reading (as noted by Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 24). Similar internal leaps create a non-

UMI

sense reading at Lk 9:10 and a reading supported by 472 at Lk 15:13; and one has been corrected afterwards at Lk 12:4. At Jn 11:3 the scribe made a backwards leap, and then corrected himself. And at Jn 6:54 the scribe started to write το αιμα after μου, but caught himself after writing only the article.

Martin and Kasser, _ibid_., note: "Quant aux corrections, certaines d'entre elles, en tout cas, ont dû être faites de suite, au cours de la transcription, par le copiste lui-même." And they then refer to Lk 24:18, Jn 4:42, and Jn 12:31. I am not, however, sure about when the correction at Lk 24:18 was made, although it is clearly by the scribe.

See also Martini, _Il problema_, pp. 60-61, and in general on the corrections, pp. 60-62, and his "Lista 4," pp. 170-72. By the way, his list (for Luke only, of course) should be corrected by adding 10:28 and by deleting 18:11a, where no correction seems to have occurred. Also, both Martini and the edition say that only ημερα was added at Lk 9:22. However, it seems certain that τη was also added, since it extends into the right margin.

[82] Martin and Kasser, _Papyrus Bodmer XIV_, p. 23, ascribe these three corrections to the same hand. The reading of the correction at Lk 17:14a is singular, being clearly a harmonization to Mt 8:3 (cf. also Mk 1:41 and Lk 5:13), as noted by Martin and Kasser, _ibid_., p. 26. The correction at Lk 11:31 results in a singular spelling of βασιλισα, but restores the word omitted by the scribe, as does the correction at Jn 5:5.

[83] I am not confident that these two additions are by the same hand. Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," p. 8, suggests (with "?") for Lk 11:34b ο οφθαλμος σου, for which he cites support from $\text{syr}^{c,s}$ $\text{cop}^{sa,bopt}$. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," _Studies_, p. 121, accepts this reading.

[84] See Martin and Kasser, _Papyrus Bodmer XIV_, p. 24; Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," p. 4 n. 2.

[85] In some of these cases, of course, one may be in doubt as to whether the scribe actually made the correction. Deletions are always problematic, but even additions may not be clear. For example, Finegan, _Encountering New Testament Manuscripts_, p. 124, says of the correction at Jn 1:4:

> "Because the Eta inserted above the line is written slightly differently and more heavily than the Eta in the line, it may be supposed that this correction was made by a person other than the original scribe."

I believe, though, that the difference in writing here is probably just a consequence of the requirement of inserting a letter in a restricted space, and that the scribe himself made the correction. Indeed, the difference in writing is very small. Cf. the comments by Fee concerning the writing by the scribe of P^{66} during his correcting, cited in Chapter V, note 38.

[86] Cf. Martini, Il problema, pp. 61-62. Note, by the way, that at Lk 6:38, 12:28, 17:11, 24:15, and Jn 8:50, P^{75c} goes to the reading found in B* and B^{3} corrects to the reading found in P^{75*}, although each of these five readings involves only an orthographic change. For information on the correctors of B, I have relied on Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Vaticanum (Leipzig: Giesecke et Devrient, 1867). Tischendorf notes (p. XXVIII) concerning B^{3}, a corrector of the tenth or eleventh century:

> "Praeter alia autem quae secundum ille corrector ad exemplar suum redegit, egit hoc ut rem grammaticam antiquissimae scripturae propriam reformaret. Curavit ν ἐφελκ. eliminandum ante consonam, supplevit ante vocalem; ει et ι inter se confusa ad legem grammaticorum exegit, item αι et ε; . . . ."

We may also note here that both P^{75*} and B* wrote σχιμμα at Jn 7:43, which was then corrected in both manuscripts, as noted by Colwell, "External Evidence," p. 6. P^{66} makes the same error at Jn 9:16b, but did not correct it.

[87] See Martin and Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer XIV, p. 24: "Une revision méthodique du texte n'est cependant guère probable en présence des imperfections qui subsistent." Colwell, "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 117, similarly notes: "There is no evidence of revision of his work by anyone else, or in fact of any real revision, or check. Only one out of five of his singular readings (including nonsense readings) is corrected. The control had been drilled into the scribe before he started writing."

[88] Papyrus Bodmer XIV, p. 19.

[89] *Il problema*, p. 60. Martini is, of course, referring only to the Lukan text of P^{75}, but the rate of correction is about the same in John (60 corrections in Luke, 56 in John).

[90] "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 118.

[91] *Ibid*., p. 121.

[92] Cf. Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 24 ("les fautes qui subsistent sont relativement peu nombreuses"); Metzger, "The Bodmer Papyrus of Luke and John," *Expository Times*, 73 (1961-62), p. 203; King, "Notes on Luke," p. 234 ("exceptional diligence was shown in regard to the text") and pp. 234-35 ("There are very few corrections for the simple reason that there are few mistakes and most of these corrections seem to have been made by the original hand."); Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 51 (P^{75} "is a relatively careful exemplar of a sound and faithful philological tradition").

[93] "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," p. 32.

[94] *Ibid*., p. 30.

[95] *Ibid*.

[96] *Il problema*, p. 54.

[97] *Ibid*.

[98] *Ibid*.

[99] *Ibid*., p. 55. For the last portion of text, Martini says "sei e mezzo corretti;" the half-corrected reading would seem to be Lk 24:18.

[100] *Ibid*.

[101] *Ibid.*

[102] *Ibid*.

[103] *Ibid*.

[104] Mees explains this addition as follows ("Lesarten," p. 376): "Städtenamen stehen im N.T. gewöhnlich ohne Artikel, ausser sie sollen besonders hervorgehoben werden. P^{75} hebt auf diese Weise zu Beginn des 2. Kapitels «Kana» besonders hervor, gegen die übrige Textbezeugung, obgleich dies durch die Apposition schon genügend geschehen war. Der Neubeginn des Kapitels und die Bedeutung des dort sich abspielenden Ereignisses dürften dazu beigetragen haben."

[105] That this addition could be seen as natural is indicated by the fact that 1200 makes the same addition after τον αρτον pri in Jn 6:32.

[106] The absence of the verb here follows "the Semitic pattern" (BDF, §128[7]).

[107] According to BDF, §365, this addition gives the "most definite form of negation," ου μη.

[108] There are also the two nonsense dittographies, Lk 12:11a and 12:11b; it is clear that the scribe's attention drifted at this place in his copying. Note also that the dittography at Lk 6:44 has been corrected (this one could have been caused by a backward leap: ακανθω*νσυ*λλεγουσι*νσυ*κα).

[109] "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," pp. 43-44.

[110] The others are 9:34, 10:39, and 13:34; see *Il problema*, pp. 14-41.

[111] *Ibid*., p. 141.

[112] The last occurrence of εγενετο εν τω before Lk 16:22 seems to be at Lk 14:1. The use of εν τω is discussed in BDF, §404. On this general issue of harmonization, see the comment by Fee ("Modern Text Criticism," p. 159): "The fact is that a variant may be regarded as original *because it conforms* to the author's style, or it may be regarded as *secondary because a scribe may have made it conform* to the author's prevailing style."

[113] Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," p. 33, counts "ten instances in Luke and three in John where it [P^{75}] singularly (or nearly so) omits the article." In my list Jn 5:30 is due to Edwards; probably Fee includes Lk 15:6 and 16:18.

[114] This was obviously caused by haplography.

[115] Cf. BDF, §260. This is another one of the singulars which Martini thinks may be correct; see *Il problema*, p. 140 and p. 80 on Lk 8:35 (where P^{75} B alone omit the article). But see Birdsall's reply ("Rational Eclecticism," p. 43): "Yet its absence may be a stylistic peculiarity of the Alexandrian tradition: certainly the norms of Greek syntax are not reflected in it, and not being as convinced as Martini of the excellence and neutrality of that tradition, I should be loth to accept it [i.e., the article's absence at Lk 10:39] as a mark of Lukan style."

[116] Cf. BDF, §257(3).

[117] In vs. 21 P^{75} has the article, but Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.* αμαρτανω, 4.b., cites some examples (including Sir 7:7) without the article.

[118] This would seem to be another case of haplography.

[119] Cf. BDF, §260. Mees, "Lesarten," p. 375, explains the omission as follows: "Auch hier hat P^{75} diese Episode mit dem Vorausgehenden als eine zeitlich nicht auseinanderliegende Kette von Ereignissen gesehen und daher den Artikel gestrichen."

[120] Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 46, remarks: "Kilpatrick has suggested that while frequent use of pronouns was a feature of Hellenistic Greek, the tendency was to remove them under the influence of the more succinct norm of classical Greek. If we accept and apply this criterion, we find, perhaps to our surprise, that the balance of acceptability lies with P^{75} [compared to P^{45}]."

Birdsall comes to this conclusion by looking at only a few readings, most of which are non-singular. In fact, P^{45} has 11 omissions of pronouns among its 222 significant singulars, while P^{75} has 9 such omissions among 119 significant singulars.

[121] Martini, *Il problema*, p. 140, thinks that this reading could be genuine, since the other witnesses disagree among themselves: "ritengo vi sia realmente la possibilità che P^{75} abbia la lezione buona, da cui si è allontanato secondariamente e variamente il resto della tradizione. In 9,34 sembra di trovarsi di fronte a vari tentativi di rettificazione sintattica; . . ."

The textual evidence here is as follows:

εκεινους εισελθειν	ς P^{45} rell
εισελθειν εκεινους	4 7 659
εκεινους ελθειν	S
εισελθειν αυτους	ℵ B L 1241
αυτους εισελθειν	C 157 435
εισελθειν αυτον	1604
εισελθειν	P^{75}

In view, though, of P^{75}'s clear tendency to omit, I believe that here some explanation must be found of how the other readings arose other than by expansion from the shortest reading found in P^{75}. Such an explanation is readily forthcoming, since the presence of αυτους could be due to the influence of the same word in vs. 34a. Moreover, the reading of S could come from the majority reading by a leap: εκεινουςεισελθειν. The readings with the pronoun second could be an assimilation to what appears to be the general usage with this articular infinitive construction. And 1604 has just slipped in referring to Jesus alone. Finally, then, the omission by P^{75} is just one more careless omission by this scribe, or perhaps an attempt at improvement of style by abbreviating.

[122] Martini, *ibid.*, p. 142, thinks that this reading too (which he considers as sub-singular with support from 892) could be genuine. Here again reasons for the divergence within the tradition are easy to find, without viewing P^{75}'s reading as original. See, e.g., the quotation from Metzger in Chapter I, p. 19, above. And Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 48, says: "12:31 however seems to point to carelessness on the part of P^{75} omitting τοῦ θεοῦ (v.l. αὐτοῦ) against all other attestation."

[123] The omission here could be by a leap: ηρωτησανουναυτον.

[124] The reading of P^{75} appears to arise from the reading of B by a leap: ετιτε. Martini, however, says (*Il problema*, p. 52): "La forma di P^{75} è in sé plausibile, e non appare senz'altro come *lapsus*."

[125] This may again be a leap: οτεδε.

[126] Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," p. 44, notes: "All MSS and text-types showed remarkable ambiguity with variations of the ὅτι-*recitativum*. But generally, MSS tended to reject it rather than to add it, and P^{75} B tended to preserve (add?)

it more than others." However, the only singular of P^{75} involving the conjunction is an omission. If Fee is correct, then, P^{75} is here going against the tendency of its text-type or Alexandrian ancestor.

[127] Porter, "An Analysis," p. 73, refers to Jn 5:30, where θελημα is the object of ζητω, as a parallel to P^{75}'s reading here, and remarks: "The scribe of Pap75, recognizing that 'willing' included the corresponding action of 'doing,' might have omitted ποιειν as being redundant. It is equally possible that ποιειν could have been added to emphasize the practical implications of the gospel for this life--implications which some Gnostics ignored."

Given the external evidence these two possibilities hardly seem equally likely.

[128] The noun has been restored by $P^{75c(man\ 2)}$, who also omitted one σ in βασιλισσα by writing βασιλισα νοτου.

[129] The loss of ωρα makes the meaning difficult, but I suppose that one could supply some suitable noun as understood from the context.

[130] It appears that, if P^{75}'s exemplar had lines about as long as P^{75}'s lines, our scribe would have seen something like this:

ΟΡΝΙϹ
ΠΤΕΡΥΓΑϹ

And thus the leap from one Ϲ to the other would have been facilitated.

However, several writers have suggested that P^{75} may preserve the original text here, and that the longer texts have arisen by harmonization to the parallel in Mt 23:37. Already Martin and Kasser (Papyrus Bodmer XIV, p. 27) say: "Ils [the words in the longer texts] pourraient bien être un développement explicatif secondaire." And Martini also thinks that P^{75} may be correct here, saying (Il problema, p. 141 [cf. also p. 140]): "la lezione breve sembra più efficace, mentre quella lunga ha l'aria di una addizione esplicativa. I sospetti su di questa sono aggravati dal fatto che si presenta in almeno due forme diverse." Similarly, Birdsall ("Rational Eclecticism," p. 48) notes Martini's claim and adds that "one might suggest harmonization as the origin of the reading of the rest."

In fact, though, it is clear that it is the reading of A K M al at Lk 13:34 which is a harmonization to Mt 23:37,

UMI

but not the reading of ς pm. The reading of A K M al is thus seen to be certainly secondary, but there would appear to be no explanation for the majority reading if P⁷⁵'s reading were correct. (Note, by the way, that at Mt 23:37 only Γ 1216 make the reverse assimilation.)

[131] Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 27, comment: "Ces mots ne sont pas indispensables; rien dans la suite ne montre qu'il s'agit d'un repas de noce." Of course, we may imagine that the superfluity of the words might be the occasion for a scribe to remove them. But perhaps only a leap is involved: υπο τινος εις γαμους.

[132] Martini, *Il problema*, pp. 49-50, remarks: "la combinazione di asindeto e di mancanza di soggetto rende l'espressione eccessivamente dura; si tratta quasi certamente di errore, tenuto conto anche del fatto che P⁷⁵ è solo: . . . E' possibile pensare che l'archetipo di P⁷⁵-B avesse già una lacuna, a cui B abbia rimediato, seguito poi da qualche altro."

Martini's hypothesis that the scribe of B created the reading now found in B would seem unlikely, since that reading does have a certain diversity already at an early period, and would appear to go back to some Alexandrian ancestor of B. But, in any case, one might well think that one or more scribes could have found the majority reading's shift of subject from the younger son to the father awkward.

[133] This omission is obviously due to a leap: ο θεριζωμεν . . . ο θεριζων εγω. Porter, "An Analysis," p. 72, says, "Though "On the other hand, the saying [Jn 4:37] could be a moralizing gloss."

[134] This again could be a leap: απηλθεν προς αυτον. Porter (*ibid.*) refers to the omission (in most witnesses) of the *same* words in Jn 1:19, and claims: "In each instance, it is more likely that the words were added for clarity than that they were intentionally omitted."

It is not clear what Porter's evidence for this assertion might be, and in any case he simply dismisses the possibility that the words were *accidentally* omitted, surely the most reasonable explanation of P⁷⁵'s omission at Jn 4:47.

[135] This is another obvious leap: λαλων την δοξαν την ιδιαν. I suppose that a suitable noun (even δοξαν from the following clause) could be supplied in order to give sense to the reading.

[136] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 121, notes: "The best example [of the scribe's choosing brevity] is John 12:38 where instead of 'the word which he said' the redundant 'which he said' is omitted."

[137] *Ibid*. For a different point of view, see the comment by King, "Notes on Luke," p. 239, concerning the singulars of P^{75} in Luke: "Much the most frequent instance is the omission of a word serving in an explanatory capacity. Four times it is a pronoun and seven times another part of speech. In all cases the canons of transcriptional evidence favor the omission, particularly in two cases where the other manuscripts are themselves divided between alternative explanatory expressions (9:34 αὐτούς or ἐκείνους and 14:32 τὰ πρὸς, πρὸς, εἰς, or τὰ εἰς)."

The a priori use of the *lectio brevior* rule is evident in King's claim. By the way, the omission at Lk 14:32 is removed from our list on the basis of the citation in the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland of "pc" in its support, but I have found no specific manuscript which gives this support.

[138] One of the additions here (Jn 6:5a) is due to Edwards' analysis. However, Colwell ("Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 114) refers specifically to the addition at Jn 6:57, and later (p. 121) cites the reading at Jn 8:55. Presumably Colwell is also including readings which are here asterisked: Lk 12:24, 14:8b, 14:25b, 23:3; Jn 2:24, 8:22, 8:34. And there are also the corrections of added pronouns at Lk 11:7a, 12:18, and 14:23, as well as the correction of an omitted pronoun at Lk 12:53.

Furthermore, it is not precisely clear what Colwell is considering to be a "personal pronoun." If we confine ourselves to those so listed by Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §325, then we have two additions (Jn 6:57 and 8:55) and only two omissions (Lk 11:46 and Jn 10:17). The omissions are increased by five if we include the intensive pronoun αυτος (Smyth, §327), which is, of course, used as a personal pronoun: Lk 8:22, 9:34, 12:31, 13:1a; Jn 5:12. So we would then have seven omissions and two additions.

[139] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 117, notes that P^{75}'s transpositions "usually involve two words, occasionally three," but he counts (p. 116) 11 cases plus 4 more due to corrected leaps: Lk 14:10; Jn 4:9, 7:18, 14:19. However, Jn 4:9 is not singular (by von Soden), and Colwell has

followed the editors' incorrect transcription at Jn 7:18. There are also possible leaps involved at Lk 24:27; Jn 4:54, and 10:32. On the other hand, Jn 14:19 appears not to be caused by a leap.

[140] The order of the words here is parallel to that in vs. 13, but contrary to that in vs. 14 according to P^{39vid} P^{75} B W pc.

[141] Mees, "Lesarten," p. 377, supposes a deliberate alteration here: "Die Heilung des Sohnes des königlichen Beamten wird vom Evangelisten als das zweite Wunder seines Berichtes bezeichnet. Der Nachdruck liegt natürlich darauf, dass es das zweite ist, so P^{66}, B, rel. P^{75} denkt hier weniger an den Gesamtzusammenhang, sondern vielmehr an das, was Jesus bei dieser Gelegenheit getan hat. Er stellt daher das Verbum voran."

This scenario seems to me to be unconvincing.

[142] I suppose that P^{75}'s reading comes from that of B pc. A leap would also explain the reading of P^{75} as arising from that of P^{45vid} ℵ A K Θ Λ Π Ψ al: πολλα εργα καλα εδειξα, and here 4 words would be involved.

[143] King, "Notes on Luke," p. 239, claims: "The order, however, in 24:27 does seem to have significance. The words 'in all the Scriptures' are placed at the end of the sentence giving them considerably greater emphasis and suggesting how deeply impressed was this scribe or some earlier one by the fullness of the Old Testament testimony to Christ."

This is possible, but again it seems easier to imagine that the transposition has arisen by accident. Our scribe gives no clear indication of being prepared to rearrange his text for such purposes of emphasis.

[144] It is possible that the scribe first wrote θεον ουδεις πωποτε εορακεν under the influence of 1 Jn 4:12: θεον ουδεις πωποτε τεθεαται.

[145] The scribe caught this error while he was copying; perhaps there was a leap involving one letter: και μαρτυρει περι εμου.

[146] The addition at Lk 17:14a by the second hand is also a harmonization to a parallel (see note 82 above). The reading at Jn 1:27 is an assimilation to the firm parallels at Mt 3:11, Mk 1:7, and Lk 3:16; it certainly is possible that the scribes of P^{66}, P^{75}, and 472 could have made this

change independently. Note that at Ac 13:25 αξιος is replaced by ικανος in 36 181 307 337 460.

Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 113, includes this reading among the *singulars* of both P^{66} and P^{75}. Cf. also Chapter V, note 153.

[147] This text of Mt 3:16 could, of course, have been the one known to the scribe of P^{75}. At Mk 1:10 A 1555 omit το.

[148] This could also be due to the context, as Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 121, notes: "In Luke 8:21 [in P^{75}], Jesus replies, logically enough, to the questioner rather than the crowd."

[149] This reading is due to Edwards, and is not included by Porter in his discussion of this passage ("An Analysis," pp. 72-73).

[150] This could also have been influenced by φαγωσιν later in the verse, as is noted by Porter, *ibid*., p. 73. Porter's suggestion that the reading could be "impersonal and equivalent to a passive" seems unnecessary.

[151] On the basis of a quite different approach, Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism," pp. 180-81, found that P^{75} and B were comparatively pure from the influence of parallels.

[152] See pp. 528-29 above.

[153] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 114, remarks: "the bare words 'the Father' have the usual possessive 'my' added." On the "agreement" with syr^{s} see the comments by Sebastian P. Brock in Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 95-96.

[154] Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 113 and p. 121; Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 20: "Plusieurs de ces erreurs s'expliquent par l'influence du contexte." Some examples are discussed by them on pp. 20-21. A few other readings could be included here; see notes 140, 148, and 150 above.

[155] See the comment by Brown, *John*, p. CXXXV: "The language of the discourses achieves a monotonous grandeur by repetition of simple words and not by the use of highly literary vocabulary." Cf. the remarks by Fee, *Papyrus*, pp.

39-41, concerning "Johannine variation."

The repetition of some words would, of course, tempt a scribe to repeat others as well, and to remove any differences in wording.

[156] This is noted by Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 21.

[157] Martini, *Il problema*, p. 48, grants: "si può pensare che la lezione del papiro sia dovuta a errore scribale." Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 121, says: "In P^{75} (Luke 11:32) Jesus is a greater *person* than Jonah."

While the shift from neuter to masculine accords with the fact that Jesus is being discussed, it should be noted that the form πλειονα was perhaps attracted to the following ιωνα, and it may really be this similarity which occasioned the change. (To make P^{75}'s construction sensical we should read ἰδοῦ, the imperative; cf. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.* ἰδού.)

[158] Note that P^{75} makes the same substitution at Jn 11:12 (and at Lk 16:31, where perhaps accidental support exists). King, "Notes on Luke," p. 240, cites the two Lukan passages, and says: "It rather neatly shows how prominent was the thought of resurrection in the mind of this scribe or some previous one." Of course, the resurrection would be naturally suggested by απο νεκρων in Lk 16:30 and by εκ νεκρων in 16:31.

[159] Porter, "An Analysis," p. 72, says that this gives "a striking saying of Jesus: 'Other water I shall give him...'" Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, pp. 20-21, had already remarked, though: "J. IV 14 αλλο est amené par le neutre το υδωρ qui suit immédiatement. Remarquons ici que, dans une même succession de mots, J. V 30 αλλα est le résultat d'une correction de αλλο." At Jn 5:30 το θελημα appears to have caused the error. (Recall, too, that P^{75} has two orthographic singulars with ο for α.)

[160] See BDF, §§233-35, for various confusions of case with επι.

[161] Porter, "An Analysis," p. 73, remarks: "The reading of Pap75 suggests that the emphasis is on the revelation of knowledge and that that which the disciples heard they were to speak rather than put into action."

[162] Even before the discovery of P^{75}, it had been suggested that ο ποιμην was original, and that η θυρα arose from a misreading of the Aramaic original: see Black, An Aramaic Approach, p. 259 n. 1, and Porter, "An Analysis," p. 74. However, most commentators seem to suppose that the reading of P^{75} is an assimilation to the context. See Porter, "An Analysis," p. 74 ("probably the result of the scribe's attempt to harmonize the saying to the immediate context"); Brown, John, p. 386 ("'gate' is the more unexpected and difficult reading; 'shepherd' may well have been introduced by copyists in an attempt to make the explanation of the parable a consistent picture"); and Metzger, Commentary, p. 229 ("an early alleviation of the text, introduced by copyists who found the expression 'the door of the sheep' too difficult"). Colwell, "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 113, also includes this reading under harmonizations to the immediate context.

Weigandt, on the other hand, suggests that P^{75} is correct here ("Zum Text," pp. 50-51), and claims that both readings are difficult (p. 50): "Ich meine, es lässt sich ausser der zahlenmässig überwältigenden Bezeugung für die Lesart ἡ θύρα kein triftigeres Argument ins Feld führen als für die Lesart ὁ ποιμήν." The difference in attestation is, of course, impressive, but Weigandt has a further claim (p. 51): "Da aber P^{75} vor und der Codex Vaticanus nach der alexandrinischen Revision geschrieben sein dürfte, erscheint es möglich, dass in Joh. X 7 ὁ ποιμήν mit anderen der oben genannten (Sonder-)Lesarten von P^{75} bei dieser Revision ausgeschieden wurde."

In his reference to a "revision" Weigandt is relying on Aland, and Fee's comment cited above in note 19 makes this idea quite dubious. Further, of course, it is difficult to see how such a "revision" could have resulted in the elimination of the original reading from all the witnesses except P^{75} and the Coptic versions. Note that even P^{66} has the majority reading and could be earlier than P^{75}.

Kilpatrick, "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," p. 40, seems to think that the Coptic reading may have arisen from P^{75}, although he does not commit himself on the question of the authentic text.

I believe that the reading of P^{75} should be viewed as a harmonization to the context, and furthermore that several scribes or translators could have made the same harmonization independently, since the word introduced occurs several times in the context. Therefore, the agreement at Jn 10:7 between P^{75} and the Coptic versions does not necessarily indicate a genealogical dependence at this point.

[163] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p. 121, views this as one of P^{75}'s "slight, superficially logical harmonizations to context. (Cf. also Porter's comments in "An Analysis," p. 74.) Metzger, "Bodmer Papyrus," p. 203, says: "Though at first this reading may seem to be more appropriate, on further consideration it appears that the Evangelist would almost certainly not have used this verb in view of the immediately following explanation (that Jesus had not been speaking of natural sleep but of death)."

P^{75}'s reading is thus an excellent example of what Hort spoke of as "the appearance of improvement with the absence of its reality," and "the semblance of superiority and the latent inferiority" (*Introduction*, p. 27).

[164] Porter, "An Analysis," p. 74, claims: "One can conjecture that the reading of Pap75 arose during a period of persecution when the thought of God's preserving those who love him seemed more appropriate. . . . The reading of Pap75 could be the earlier reading." Harmonization to the context seems to be an adequate explanation of P^{75}'s reading.

[165] See BDF, §107, and Martini, *Il problema*, pp. 112-13.

[166] Noted by Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 25. On the two forms see Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*, and BDF, §30(3). At Lk 4:18 εινεκεν occurs, and perhaps the scribe remembered that.

[167] Cf. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.v.*, and BDF, §47(4). At Mt 5:13 and Mk 9:50 there is also considerable variation in the manuscripts, and some manuscripts shift spelling within a verse (D at Mt 5:13, ℵ* A* B D f^1 28 565 at Mk 9:50).

[168] On the confusion generally see BDF, §§80-81. On απηλθαν here note the remarks of Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, pp. 24-25; the comment by Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 40, that P^{75} has the Hellenistic form; and especially the discussion of the aorist forms by Martini, *Il problema*, pp. 119-21. Martini (p. 121) reports that for ηλθον and its compounds P^{75} has the forms in α in Luke 10 of 20 times, the highest percentage of any witness examined by Martini. B supports P^{75} in all but one place, which must be (although Martini doesn't cite it) Lk 10:30.

[169] Note that at Jn 4:17 P^{75} has ειπας with most manuscripts, while ℵ B* have ειπες.

[170] P^{45} does this at Lk 9:32; see Chapter II, note 96.

[171] Martin and Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer XIV, p. 21, cite four cases of the omission of augments (Lk 13:13, 17:28, 22:41, and 24:27), but these all find support in Tischendorf.

[172] This could be taken as an orthographic singular, but since P^{75} clearly errs concerning augments, it is possible that the scribe has done so here also.

[173] Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 46, says that this "looks like a simple error." The sounds are of course close.

[174] This may be nothing more than another case of ο for α.

[175] Cf. also Jn 5:16, where P^{75} has support. Mees, "Lesarten," p. 378, again gives an involved explanation: "Die Juden suchen Jesus auf alle mögliche Weise nachzustellen, weil er den Lahmen vom Teiche Bethesda am Sabbat geheilt hatte. Dem. Imperf. des Versuches entspricht im Hauptsatz ebenfalls ein Imperfekt, das zudem der Schilderung und der Vergegenwärtigung der in der Vergangenheit spielenden Handlung entspricht. P^{75}, 579, denken an dieses spezielle Wunder der Heilung und setzen den Aorist."

[176] Mees, ibid., pp. 378-79, again finds a "reason" for this shift: "Kurz darauf sagt Jesus, dass er nichts von dem verloren gehen lassen werde, was ihm der Vater gegeben hat. Dies geschah aber durch ewigen Ratschluss, daher das Perfekt. P^{75} denkt nur an den unmittelbaren Zusammenhang mit den vorausgehenden Versen und daher an die Menschen, die durch ihn zum Glauben gelangen, daher Aorist."

[177] This is a harmonization to context.

[178] This could well be just another case of α for ε.

[179] See also Jn 7:35b, where P^{75} has support, and Jn 3:27 (which is taken as orthographic, since the indicative would be nonsense in context).

[180] This is a harmonization to parallels (or perhaps to context; see note 150 above).

[181] This is a harmonization to context.

[182] Martini, *Il problema*, p. 48, regards both of these as "errori *palesi*." (Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 50, cites only the first case.) The sounds could, of course, be easily confused; cf. BDF, §443(1).

[183] See the same shift without the "o" at Lk 12:45b, as noted by Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 21.

[184] This would seem to be just a sound confusion, although the sequence ουδε ... ουτε is (barely) possible; see Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2941, who refers to Plato, *Charm*. 171B (Burnet has the line as 171C1), and calls the construction "rare."

[185] "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," p. 43, and "Three Problems of New Testament Text," *Novum Testamentum*, 21 (1979), p. 290. Incidentally, in the latter article Kilpatrick cites 2643 and it^{r2} as supporting P^{75}. The Old Latin manuscript r^2 does indeed read *et factum est*, according to H. C. Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2. r_2* (London: Quaritch, 1919), p. 103. However, I have not been able to find a printed source for the citation of 2643. (Aland's *Kurzgefasste Liste* says that 2643 is in Berkeley, but this seems not to be the case. According to Theodore G. Grieder, *The Isaac Foot Library* [Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa Barbara, 1963], p. 7, the Foot manuscript containing the "Evangelia et Apocalypsis" [apparently 2643] is now at the University of California, Riverside.)

[186] "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," p. 43. A typographical error seems to have confused Kilpatrick's presentation in his "Three Problems." There he says (p. 290): "The direction of change in the καί/δέ variation, other things being equal, seems to have been from δέ to καί." This should be, I believe, "from καί to δέ," since Kilpatrick goes on to say that Hellenistic Greek generally and Biblical Greek in particular overworked και, and thus "we may suspect a tendency in scribes to reduce the incidence of και." He also claims that under the influence of Atticism "δέ would be substituted for καί."

[187] BDF, §172, and Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.* περισσευω.

[188] However, I have failed to find any reference to an appropriate form of (δι)εγειρω.

[189] "John iv 41 ΠΛΕΙΟΝ or ΠΛΕΙΟΥΣ," *Novum Testamentum*, 18 (1976), pp. 131-32. J. K. Elliott, "The Two Forms of the Third Declension Comparative Adjectives in the New Testament," *Novum Testamentum*, 19 (1977), pp. 234-39, follows Kilpatrick in seeing P^{75}'s reading as original, but reduces the argument to the following (p. 237): "By contrast, in John there is no example of the contracted forms and so πλεῖον should be read at iv 41." Elliott means, of course, that there is no contracted form in John except (perhaps) at 4:41, but in any case this way of putting the matter seems too mechanical. Elliott's argument would suggest that the author could not have varied his style in any way. Indeed, Elliott is simply doing at a somewhat more sophisticated level what scribes did all the time: harmonize differences.

Kilpatrick presents a more careful argument, although even his claims seem unconvincing.

[190] "John iv 41," p. 131. A citation from Moeris supports this claim, but appears to be confused; see Kilpatrick's conjectural emendation at p. 131 n. 1.

[191] At Jn 15:2 ℵ Cl read πλειω for πλειονα, and this *would* be a possible Atticistic correction. Kilpatrick cites 15:2 as an occurrence of πλειονα, but doesn't refer to ℵ Cl. Elliott, "The Two Forms," p. 238, does refer to the reading of ℵ, and says: "At John xv 2 πλείονα is also required to agree with καρπόν: the indeclinable form is secondary." Surely ℵ's reading is secondary, but πλειω is (I believe) a perfectly correct masculine accusative form.

[192] Kilpatrick cites 565 within f^{1}, following his finding ("Codex 565 of the Gospels," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 25 [1969], p. 130) that 565 is a member of family 1 "from somewhere between Jn. i.42 and ii.5 to the end of John." W reads here: πλεον παντων τουτων.

[193] "John iv 41," p. 131.

[194] The reading προβατα for αρνια in C* D 1^{36} at vs. 15 is also clearly a harmonization to vs. 16.

[195] See the discussion by Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (xiii-xxi)*, Anchor Bible, Vol. 29A (Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), pp. 1103-4.

[196] "John iv 41," pp. 131-32.

[197] The other occurrences of the comparative of in John have the following Latin renderings:

4:1	πλειονας	plures
7:31	πλειονα	plura it^{rell} vg^{rell} : pluriora it^{f} : plures vg^{X}
15:2	πλειονα	plurimum it$^{b,c,f,ff^2,l}$: multum it^{e} : ampliorem it$^{a,d,r^1}$: maiorem it^{q} : plus it^{aur} vg
21:15	πλε(ι)ον τουτων	plus quam istos it^{d} : plus his it^{f} vg (hiis R W) : om it^{rell}

At 7:31 D Δ have πλεονα, at 15:2 ℵ Cl have πλειω, and at 21:15, besides the readings noted above and in note 192, πλεον τουτων is read by ℵ B C D L S X Λ Ω 0141 4 33 122 892^{supp} Cyr.

[198] See Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, p. 26 (where P^{75}'s reading is incorrectly cited as ανηρ πλουσιος ονοματι νευης; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 24 [1962], p. 176 n. 22); Metzger, "Bodmer Papyrus," p. 202; *idem*, *Text*, pp. 41-42; *idem*, *Commentary*, pp. 165-66; Kilpatrick, "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," pp. 39-40; King, "Notes on Luke," p. 239; Weigandt, "Zum Text," p. 47 and p. 49; Henry J. Cadbury, "A Proper Name for Dives," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 81 (1962), pp. 399-402; *idem*, "The Name for Dives," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 84 (1965), p. 73; K. Grobel, "...Whose Name was Neves," *New Testament Studies*, 10 (1963-64), pp. 373-82.

[199] L. Th. Lefort, "Le nom du mauvais riche (Lc 16 19) et la tradition copte," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 37 (1938), p. 66, translates the Coptic back into Greek--before the discovery of P^{75}--as ὀνόματι Νινευής. Cadbury, "A Proper Name," p. 400, points out that the construction in P^{75} and the Sahidic is "symmetrical" to ὀνόματι Λάζαρος in vs. 20.

[200] See Metzger, "Bodmer Papyrus," p. 202, and Text, p. 42; Fitzmyer, "Papyrus," p. 177; Kilpatrick, "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," p. 40. Martin and Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer XIV, p. 26, say: "La différence entre les deux noms propres [νευης and νινευης] peut provenir d'haplographie ou de dittographie." And King, "Notes on Luke," p. 239, says: "the Sahidic [was] seemingly formed by reduplication." However, the analysis by Grobel appears to show conclusively that the Sahidic form is prior to the form found in P^{75}.

[201] Grobel, "Name," p. 381.

[202] Ibid., pp. 381-82. Grobel does, by the way, cite Greek words in the Coptic script throughout his article.

[203] Il problema, pp. 116-18 and pp. 97-99 (on ιωαν(ν)ης). See also Chapter V, p. 422, above.

[204] Ibid., p. 141. Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 50, cites Martini, and calls συγκυρια "uncommon." Bauer, Wörterbuch, s. συγκυρια, finds κατα συγκυριαν elsewhere only in Eustathius, while several ancient occurrences of κατα συντυχιαν are noted in LSJ, s. συντυχια.

[205] Papyrus Bodmer XIV, p. 26 (and cf. also p. 22 and pp. 25-26). As they note, the συγ- for συν- is the result of the correction not extending to the prefix.

[206] The writing looks quite similar, and Martin and Kasser, ibid., p. 22, refer to this reading "qu'il [le scribe] a ensuite corrigée." Birdsall, "Rational Eclecticism," p. 50, is thus misleading when he says that this reading is due to "the corrector of P^{75}," and even more misleading when he calls συντυχιαν a "gloss."

[207] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 121, says that the scribe twice "prefers the simple to the compound word." Apparently Colwell is thinking of Lk 13:25 and 23:6 (to be discussed below). Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," p. 33, says that P^{75} reads the simple for the compound form "singularly at [Luke] 11:22, 13:25, and 15:22." But P^{75} has some support (including the Alexandrian 1241 at both places) at 11:22a and 15:22.

[208] See note 36 above, referring to Jn 12:36.

[209] See BDF, §229 and §231, which are referred to by Porter, "An Analysis," p. 73. Porter adds: "the fact that περί occurs in John about 70 times and ὑπέρ occurs about 15 times suggests the possibility for scribal alteration from an original ὑπέρ to περί is greater than the reverse."

The external attestation certainly indicates that the scribal shift is not as Porter claims at Jn 7:13; perhaps we have here simply another case of "logical harmonization," since "for him" would certainly fit the context.

[210] See Colwell's comment in note 207 above. Omission of prefixes is, of course, another aspect of the scribe's general tendency to shorten the text.

[211] Martini, Il problema, p. 142, sees this as possibly being original: "Il composto διαδιδόναι (comune anche a 118), tenuto conto delle altre occorrenze lucane 11,22 e 18,22, è più adatto alla situazione che non il verbo semplice: si tratta di una «elargizione distributiva» a cui è preposto l'economo fedele. La lezione di S* [i.e. ℵ*] mostra come si passi trascrizionalmente dal verbo composto al semplice."

However, the other uses of the compound verb and its appropriateness in the context may have been the reasons for the scribe's alteration. Furthermore, as noted above (note 13), 118 does not agree with P^{75} here. And Martini's reference to ℵ seems to prove the opposite of what he wants. Martini supposes that the simple form in $\aleph^{c}$ has arisen from the compound form in ℵ*. But clearly the simple form in the correction is just the usual reading being substituted for the singular reading in ℵ*; it's not the case that the corrector of ℵ is making a scribal "slip" from compound to simple verb. And thus ℵ does not give a parallel to what Martini supposes may have been the direction of scribal alteration from the compound in P^{75} to the simple form in most manuscripts.

On the contrary, the anomalous readings in ℵ* and 118 would suggest how easy it is for scribes to pass from the simple form to the compound form. In the case of P^{75}, indeed, we may suspect that a dittography occurred, with the second δ of διδοναι being read once as an α. Thus we would have: ΔΙΔΟΝΑΙ (Vorlage of P^{75}) becomes by dittography ΔΙΔΔΙΔΟΝΑΙ, which is then read ΔΙΑΔΙΔΟΝΑΙ (the reading of P^{75}). The fact that P^{75} commits two clear dittographies only a short distance before (Lk 12:11a and 12:11b), and the fact that A and Δ are so easily confused (see the example from Mk 11:31 in Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, Vol. III, p. 57) make it much more probable that this reading is a slip on the part of our scribe than that P^{75} alone preserves the original reading.

[212] See Martin and Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer XIV, p. 21, and Martini, Il problema, p. 51 and pp. 140-41, who sees a vowel confusion on the part of the scribe. In this connection one may also recall the readings at Lk 24:50; Jn 4:35, 7:49 (see the references in note 59 above).

CHAPTER VIII

THE SHORTER READING?

One of the most venerable canons of textual criticism is that the shorter reading is generally to be preferred. This principle and some possible applications of it have already been examined briefly in Chapter I, but the discovery that all six of the papyri analyzed here omit more often than they add makes it important to return to this principle, and to ask how earlier scholars could have formulated a rule which so clearly--as it turns out--goes against the scribal activity evidenced in our papyri. A few remarks may serve to place the statement of the principle and its application within a historical context.

The early formulation of the canon by Griesbach clearly presents both the view of scribal activity presupposed by the principle, and the exceptions to its utilization. Griesbach stated:

> The shorter reading (unless it lacks entirely the authority of the ancient and weighty witnesses) is to be preferred to the more verbose, for scribes were much more prone to add than to omit. They scarcely ever deliberately omitted anything, but they added many things; certainly they omitted some

> things by accident, but likewise not a few things have been added to the text by scribes through errors of the eye, ear, memory, imagination, and judgement.[1]

Griesbach went on to list certain occasions when the shorter reading is particularly to be preferred, and also to mention certain exceptional cases when the longer reading may be preferred (e.g., when the omission may have arisen by homoeoteleuton).

As noted already in Chapter I Griesbach provides no textual evidence for his claims, but is evidently attempting to summarize what he has discovered about scribal activity from his comprehensive knowledge of the witnesses available at his time.

The principle of preferring the shorter reading has been utilized most influentially within the field of New Testament textual criticism by Westcott and Hort, although--perhaps surprisingly--Hort appears not to formulate the rule explicitly.[2] However, it is clear that Hort is presupposing its correctness in the following characterization of the Western text:

> The chief and most constant characteristic of the Western readings is a love of paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences were changed, omitted, and inserted with astonishing freedom, wherever it seemed that the meaning could be brought out with greater force and definiteness. . . . An extreme form of the paraphrastic tendency is shown in the interpolation of phrases extending by some kind

> of parallelism the language of the true text; . . . Another equally important characteristic is a disposition to enrich the text at the cost of its purity by alterations or additions taken from traditional and perhaps from apocryphal or other non-biblical sources; as . . . a long interpolation . . . beginning ‘Υμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε after Matt. xx 28. . . .
>
> Besides these two marked characteristics, the Western readings exhibit the ordinary tendencies of scribes whose changes are not limited to wholly or partially mechanical corruptions. We shall accordingly find these tendencies, some of them virtually incipient forms of paraphrase, in other texts of the New Testament: but in the Western text their action has been more powerful than elsewhere. As illustrations may be mentioned the insertion and multiplication of genitive pronouns, but occasionally their suppression where they appeared cumbrous; the insertion of objects, genitive, dative, or accusative, after verbs used absolutely; the insertion of conjunctions in sentences which had none, . . .
>
> Another impulse of scribes abundantly exemplified in Western readings is the fondness for assimilation. In its most obvious form it is merely local, abolishing diversities of diction where the same subject matter recurs as part of two or more neighbouring clauses or verses, or correcting apparent defects of symmetry. But its most dangerous work is 'harmonistic' corruption, that is, the partial or total obliteration of differences in passages otherwise more or less resembling each other.[3]

Hort here claims that these tendencies within the Western text are often just examples of the general tendency of scribes to make additions to the text. Since documentary evidence is believed by Hort to be incapable of deciding between the Neutral and Western texts,[4] the decision rests ultimately on internal criteria, and it is evident that one of Hort's internal criteria is to prefer the shorter reading. Thus, faced with a shorter text and a longer text, as at Mt 20:28 where D contains a long passage missing in most witnesses, he will judge that the shorter text is authentic and the longer text represents an interpolation, rather than that the longer text is authentic and the shorter text has arisen from it by accidental omission or deliberate excision for one reason or another.[5]

Moreover, Hort's preference for the shorter reading leads him into his theory of the "Western non-interpolations," and his general statement concerning these expresses well his view that scribes tend to add:

> The almost universal tendency of transcribers to make their text as full as possible, and to eschew omissions, is amply exemplified in the New Testament. Omissions of genuine words and clauses in the Alexandrian and Syrian texts are very rare, and always easy to explain. In the Western text, with which we are here concerned, they are bolder and more numerous, but still almost always capable of being traced to a desire of giving a clearer and more vigorous presentation of the sense. But hardly any of the omissions now in question can be so explained, none in a satisfactory manner.[6]

The same preference is also involved in Hort's rejection of the Syrian text, although here he finds confirmation from the Patristic evidence.[7] But the "clearest evidence" of the lateness of the Syrian text is found by Hort in the conflate readings of that text.[8] And the force of such examples rests on the following principle:

> Where we find a variation with three variants, two of them simple alternatives to each other, and the third a combination of the other two, there is usually a strong presumption that the third is the latest and due to mixture, not the third the earliest and the other two due to two independent impulses of simplification. Peculiar contexts may no doubt sometimes give rise to this paradoxical double simplification: but as a rule internal evidence is decisive to the contrary.[9]

This statement makes clear that the presumption is that scribes tend to add to texts (or add already existing texts together), rather than omit from texts. For if omission is frequent, it is quite possible--indeed virtually necessary given the number of scribes who must have copied portions of the text--that purely by accident one scribe would have omitted part of a phrase and another scribe would have omitted the remaining part. In fact, in at least some cases the omission would have been facilitated by a scribal leap.[10] Thus, without the presupposition that addition is more likely than omission, Hort's examples of conflation would be considerably weakened.[11]

This preference for the shorter text, based on the belief that scribes tend to expand the text, continues to influence textual criticism, and in particular plays an important role in the construction of the "Standard Text"[12] presented in the third edition of the United Bible Societies' edition and in the twenty-sixth edition of Nestle-Aland. For Metzger (on behalf of the editors of the United Bible Societies' edition) cites as one of the considerations of transcriptional probability:

> In general the shorter reading is to be preferred, except where
>
> (*a*) Parablepsis arising from homoeoarcton or homoeoteleuton may have occurred (i.e., where the eye of the copyist may have inadvertently passed from one word to another having a similar sequence of letters); or where
>
> (*b*) The scribe may have omitted material which he deemed to be (i) superfluous, (ii) harsh, or (iii) contrary to pious belief, liturgical usage, or ascetical practice.[13]

In accordance with this principle Metzger frequently describes readings as "a natural expansion introduced by scribes,"[14] "a natural addition introduced by copyists,"[15] or in other ways which presume that the general tendency was to add to the text. Furthermore, the burden of proof is usually assumed by Metzger to be borne by the defender of the longer text, so that a specific "reason" for omission must be found while addition is viewed as simply to be expected. Thus, Metzger argues in reference to Mt 4:10:

> If the words ὀπίσω μου were originally in the text, no satisfactory reason can be found to account for their omission.[16]

If accidental omission were itself natural, then no particular "reason" would be required to explain the shorter text.[17] But, given the view of the editors, it is not surprising that this "Standard Text" tends to be a short text.[18]

The frequency with which scholars such as Hort and Metzger appeal to the preference for the shorter reading is doubtless in part due to the ease and objectivity of its application. Whether a particular reading fits the style of the author, is grammatically smoother, follows Semitic idiom, or is theologically more acceptable, is usually very much a matter of debate, and reaching any decision on such issues would involve the careful consideration of a great deal of evidence. But deciding whether one reading is shorter than another is, at least in most cases,[19] a perfectly straightforward task. It is therefore convenient to reduce textual questions to questions of length, and then to decide accordingly.

However, it is clear that the principle must not be pushed too far.[20] Other principles must also be taken into account, and so the eventual decision is not at all a mechanical matter.[21] But even as a more or less rough guide, the principle has not always been favored. Scrivener, for example, remarks:

> words and clauses are sometimes wilfully omitted for the sake of removing apparent difficulties . . . and

> . . . the negligent loss of whole passages through ὁμοιοτέλευτον . . . is common to manuscripts of every age and character. On the whole, therefore, the indiscriminate rejection of portions of the text regarded as supplementary, on the evidence of but a few authorities, must be viewed with considerable distrust and suspicion.[22]

And Kilpatrick has similarly commented:

> The maxim lectio breuior potior delivered Hort, on occasion, from idolatry [of ℵ and B], but is it true? When we consider the statement, 'the shorter reading is preferable,' can we see any reason, apart from repetition and tradition, why it should be right or wrong? We can produce reasons for thinking sometimes that the longer text is right and sometimes that the shorter text is right, but that will not demonstrate our maxim.[23]

Perhaps the most extreme rejection of the preference for the shorter reading is that of A. C. Clark, who claimed:

> A text is like a traveller who goes from one inn to another, losing an article of luggage at each halt.[24]

Utilizing this view of textual history Clark investigated the text of the Gospels and Acts, and--not surprisingly--tended to favor the Western text.[25] But Clark's position has not found approval among scholars, although the criticisms offered appear to relate more to the detailed application of his views to the Gospels and Acts than to the general principle that accidental omission is common or even more likely than addition.[26] In particular, Clark thought that entire lines tended to be omitted, and held these lines to have been shorter than the New Testament papyri have shown to be usual.[27]

However, Metzger does present two arguments against Clark's general position, neither of which proves to be persuasive. First, Metzger claims:

> It would be natural for [non-Gospel traditions] to slip into the text of the Gospels, either from the margins of other manuscripts or from the living memory of the Church.[28]

Of course, the characterization of such addition as "natural" presupposes that scribes tended to add, and thus simply begs the question against Clark. Secondly, Metzger's reference to the textual histories of the *Iliad* and the *Mahābhārata* appears at least partially irrelevant to Clark's view. For, although Clark postulates *accidental* omission as a major cause of scribal error, Metzger claims in rebuttal that "no scribe *deliberately* [italics mine] excised any considerable portion of either poem."[29] We are thus left with a discussion which, at least at this point, is curiously inapplicable to the question of accidental omission.[30]

Of course, as long as the debate depends on the question of one's judgment concerning what was "natural" for scribes to do, a resolution may not be expected. But, whatever may be the status of the specific theories put forward by Clark (and others), the fact is that the six papyri studied here all demonstrate a tendency to shorten the text. In many cases the omissions appear to be accidental, just as many of the additions may have arisen by unconscious assimilation to the context, parallel passages, or similar constructions. In other cases the omission may have been deliberate. But in any case the direction is clearly from a longer text to a shorter text.

Since this result is perhaps surprising[31] and has so many possible implications for the textual criticism of the New Testament, it may be useful to present here a summary table of what we have found in the six papyri. If we tabulate the additions, omissions, the difference of omitted words and added words, and the ratio of this difference to the total number of significant singulars, then we have:

	Adds	Omits	Net Words Lost	Sign. Singulars	Net Words Lost ÷ Sign. Singulars
P^{45}	28	63	102	222	.46
P^{46}	55	167	283	471	.60
P^{47}	5	18	43	51	.84
P^{66}	14	19	22	107	.21
P^{72}	16	29	27	98	.28
P^{75}	12	41	53	119	.45

The scribes thus differ considerably in their rate of loss of text, ranging from the extraordinarily careless scribe of P^{47} (who loses close to one word per error) and the unusually careless scribe of P^{46} (who loses more than one word per two errors), to the comparatively careful scribes of P^{66} and P^{72}. And, of course, these scribes differ greatly among themselves with respect to other patterns of error. Indeed, precisely because the six scribes differ in so many ways, are copying different portions of the New Testament, and are utilizing texts of different sorts, it would seem that their common habit of shortening the text is a _general_ habit, and not an anomalous feature of one or two particular scribes. To be sure, one _could_ claim that all six scribes are anomalous, but, given their many differences, such a claim would seem highly implausible, and to be based on no evidence.[32] Naturally, we might eventually discover other early papyri which would force us to revise these conclusions, but we have to work with the available evidence. And there seems in fact to be no reason to suppose that we just happened to have found manuscripts from the six scribes of antiquity who tended to shorten their text. On the contrary, it would seem that these six manuscripts should represent a fair sample (in so far as any sample of six could be fair) of the scribal activity involved in the copying of the New Testament in Egypt in the years from, say, 175 to 300.

However, we should not be tempted thereby into making the inference that all scribes at all times, or even all the scribes engaged in copying the New Testament, tended to shorten the text. It is quite possible that scribes during the second and third centuries "naturally" lost portions of the text, but that scribes in later periods just as "naturally" added to the text. In Chapter I we have already mentioned the possibility that such a shift in the way in which scribes dealt with the text could reasonably be seen as resulting from the Church's acquisition of the power to exercise "control" on the text of the New Testament, and from the explicit establishment of the New Testament canon.[33] And I believe that it is at least plausible that such a shift could have consequences for the likelihood of scribal omission or addition.

In the first place, once the explicit canonization of certain books had occurred, we may imagine that scribes and correctors would have felt a weightier obligation to preserve every word of these books in its given order. Readers of the manuscripts would have been more likely to demand such accuracy, and the institution of the Church would have been able to enforce such accuracy more consistently.[34] There is certainly some evidence that later scribes did reach much higher levels of accuracy than did any of the scribes of the papyri, and indeed even orthographic fluctuation appears to be minimal in many later manuscripts. This general striving for complete accuracy in copying could thus have balanced and even strongly outweighed whatever tendency there might have been toward omission. Accordingly, we may reasonably suppose that scribes would have been eager to preserve every word of the canonical text, and that correctors and readers would have desired such preservation. In fact, what we might expect to find are precisely the characteristics which Hort ascribes to his Syrian text:

> The qualities which the authors of the Syrian text seem to have most desired to impress on it are lucidity and completeness. They were evidently anxious to remove all stumbling-blocks out of the way of the ordinary reader, so far as this could be done without recourse to violent measures. They were apparently equally desirous that he should have the benefit of instructive matter contained in all the existing texts, provided it did not confuse the context or introduce seeming contradictions. New omissions accordingly are rare, and where they occur are usually found to contribute to apparent simplicity. New interpolations on the other hand are abundant, most of them being due to harmonistic or other assimilation, fortunately capricious and incomplete. Both in matter and in diction the Syrian text is conspicuously a full text. It delights in pronouns, conjunctions, and expletives and supplied links of all kinds, as well as in more considerable additions.[35]

Indeed, the temptation to introduce a certain class of additions, the harmonizations to parallels, would naturally have been increased by the presence of the Eusebian sections and canons beginning around 400.[36] A scribe who copied from such a manuscript would be continually reminded of the existence of parallels, and simply reading from such manuscripts would reinforce the connections among the Gospels. In contrast, the scribe copying at an earlier period would be likely to introduce parallel phrases less frequently and less systematically, since a greater conscious effort would be required to connect the diverse passages.

Moreover, that some shift in scribal activity occurred would explain how so many textual critics could place such weight on a principle which so clearly contradicts the evidence from the papyri. The documents on which earlier critics had to base their judgments concerning transcriptional probability were, of course, all from the fourth century or later. Consequently, given the evidence available to them, these critics may well have correctly concluded that scribes naturally tended to add to the text, since the scribes of these later manuscripts often (let us suppose) did just that. The relatively short manuscripts, such as א and B, would then appear to be relatively "pure," since they were free from at least many of the harmonizations and other expansions which subsequent scribes had introduced.[37] And so the critics would have correctly appealed to ℵ and B against the later accretions.

However, the fourth-century barrier has been penetrated with the discovery of the papyri,[38] and the criteria utilized in textual criticism must take into account this new set of evidence. And the investigation pursued here would seem to make impossible any simple preference for the shorter text within the New Testament. In particular, as long as the competing readings are all early,[39] the preference must lie with the longer reading. Naturally, such a statement must always be subject to the usual *ceteris paribus* clause, and so an un-critical application of the principle *lectio longior potior* would hardly be justified. Rather, what does seem to follow from this analysis is that the burden of proof should be shifted from the proponents of the longer text to the defenders of the shorter text. There does not need--at least within the earliest centuries of transmission--to be a "reason" given for an omission; rather, omission is the "natural" error for these early scribes. What does need to be stated is some list of possible exceptions to this general tendency. And the present study gives at least a preliminary indication of what the likely exceptions are. Obviously, harmonization to context is a pervasive source of error, and it very often results in additions. Other kinds of harmonizations and grammatical improvements (such as avoiding asyndeton[40]) may also involve additions.

These considerations suggest, therefore, that a canon of transcriptional probability could (in a preliminary fashion) be formulated as follows:

> In general the longer reading is to be preferred, except where:
>
> a) The longer reading appears, on genealogical grounds, to be late; or
>
> b) The longer reading may have arisen from harmonization to the immediate context, to parallels, or to general usage; or
>
> c) The longer reading may have arisen from an attempt at grammatical improvement.
>
> The frequency of omissions by scribal leaps and of omissions of certain inessential words such as pronouns must be kept in mind, and when such omissions may have occurred, the longer reading should be viewed as even more likely.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Metzger, *Text*, p. 120.

[2] Hort may have been cautious in the light of his own warning about the variety of impulses which motivated scribes; see the citation in Chapter I, note 25.

[3] *Introduction*, pp. 122-24.

[4] See the discussion by Colwell, "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and its Limitations," *Studies*, pp. 66-67.

[5] Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, p. 15, accordingly say: "The first part [of the D reading] must come from an independent source, written or oral; the second probably comes from the same, but it is in substance nearly identical with Lc xiv 8-10." In a similar way Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 53, says: "This interpolation is a piece of floating tradition, an expanded but inferior version of Lk 14.8-10."

Of course, in any specific case the decision may be complicated by a number of other factors, and with respect to the Western text at Mt 20:28 Scrivener (*Introduction*, pp. 576-77) comments:

> "It bears the internal marks of evident spuriousness, the first sentence consisting of a rhetorical antithesis as unsuitable as can be imagined to the majestic simplicity of our Lord's usual tone, while the sentiment of the rest is manifestly borrowed from Luke xiv. 8-10, although there is little or no resemblance in the words. . . . the whole language of the Greek of Cod. D, . . . , is so foreign to the style of S. Matthew's Gospel, that it seems rather to have been rendered from the Latin, . . ."

Thus, Scrivener appeals to the style of Jesus' speaking and the style of the author of the book for his rejection of this passage, and in fact elsewhere expresses doubt about the general preference for the shorter reading (*ibid*., pp. 495-96).

[6] *Introduction*, p. 175. Kilpatrick discusses the role of the shorter reading in these cases, and remarks: "We may agree that he was mistaken at [Lk] 24:51, but the important point is that Hort was prepared to depart from his obsequience toward ℵ and B on occasion on intrinsic grounds, namely in part because these readings were shorter" ("Griesbach and the Development of Text Criticism," *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, Vol. 34 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978], p. 140).

[7] See *Introduction*, pp. 107-15.

[8] *Ibid*., p. 94; the whole section, pp. 93-107, is devoted to this evidence.

[9] *Ibid*., pp. 49-50.

[10] See Kilpatrick, "The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the *Textus Receptus*," *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective*, ed. Hugh Anderson and William Barclay (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 190-91. Hort recognizes the possibility of accidental omission at Mk 6:33, but rejects this hypothesis (*Introduction*, p. 97).

[11] Of course, Hort does appeal to other considerations, as in his long discussion of Mk 6:33 (*ibid*., pp. 95-99). But these additional factors would be, I believe, too imprecise and too debatable to sustain Hort's theory without the "strong presumption" in advance that conflate readings are secondary. By the way, Colwell points out that there are conflate readings in B also; see "Genealogical Method," *Studies*, p. 70, and especially n. 3, where it is noted that B C L 892 pc have a reading which could be due to conflation of the reading found in ς pm and the reading found in W pc (the omission by ℵ* θ al is clearly by a scribal leap).

[12] See the remarks (presumably by Aland) in Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, p. 5* (= p. 43*).

[13] *Commentary*, p. xxvii. Cf. also the further claim there that: "Scribes would sometimes . . . (*c*) Add pronouns, conjunctions, and expletives to make a smoother text."

[14] *Ibid*., p. 9, *ad* Mt 3:17.

[15] *Ibid*., p. 13, *ad* Mt 5:25.

[16] *Ibid*., p. 11.

[17] It is remarkable that Metzger occasionally claims that there is no reason for omission even when a scribal leap could have occasioned the omission. E.g., in connection with Mt 26:28 (*ibid*., p. 64) Metzger says: "if it [καινης] had been present originally, there is no good reason why anyone would have deleted it." But the omission could have arisen by a leap: της καινης διαθηκης. In fact, Metzger quite often either overlooks or downplays the possibility of scribal leaps having occasioned omissions; cf. my "The Treatment of Scribal Leaps in Metzger's *Textual Commentary*," forthcoming in *New Testament Studies*.

[18] However, the editors did accept (in a split decision) the Western non-interpolations; see *Commentary*, p. 193.

[19] The only problems would seem to involve abbreviations of *nomina sacra* or orthographic variations. Of course, two or more readings may be equally short.

[20] Perhaps the most extreme use of the principle is by M.-E. Boismard, who reconstructed the presumably original readings at many places in Jn 7 by relying heavily on the "shorter readings" found in the versions and the Fathers, and commented ("Lectio brevior, potior," *Revue biblique*, 58 [1951], p. 165):

> "Si donc on voulait appliquer impartialement les règles de la critique textuelle, ne devrait-on pas dire que le texte le meilleur est le texte court représenté en gros par Chrysostome, les latins et les syriaques? Nous ne prétendons pas par là que *toutes* les omissions du texte court soient en fait l'expression du texte original, nous voulons seulement dire que, *ut in pluribus*, il doit en être ainsi."

However, Boismard's claims here and in several other works have been criticized by Metzger at length in "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," New Testament Studies, 18 (1971-72), pp. 387-95. In particular, Metzger (p. 391) remarks:

> "[Boismard] seems never to raise the question whether accidental omission in transcription or freedom of translation and/or citation might not be a more appropriate explanation for the origin of such shorter readings."

Metzger also makes the following statement (p. 396) concerning the frequency of omission:

> "While it is freely acknowledged that during the centuries the developing Textus Receptus accumulated a wide variety of words and phrases designed to alleviate contextual difficulties, it must also be conceded that omissions have likewise occurred frequently. Streeter discusses what he captions 'The Fallacy of the Shorter Text', and draws attention to A. C. Clark's quaint comparison: 'A text', as Clark put it, 'is like a traveller who loses a portion of his baggage every time he changes trains.' Of course marginal notes and expansions do creep into the text of ancient manuscripts, but at the same time omission, whether accidental or sometimes, as it appears, intentional, is also a familiar phenomenon."

Metzger's emphasis here suggests, I believe, an approach to the text which is superior to that of his Commentary with its emphasis on the naturalness of addition. (One must remember, in fairness to Metzger, that the Commentary is not meant to express Metzger's views alone, but those of a committee.)

The theoretical difficulty in following the preference for the shorter reading consistently (as Boismard comes close to doing) is well put by Edward Hobbs, "An Introduction to Methods of Textual Criticism," The Critical Study of Sacred Texts, ed. Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1979), p. 19: "if you follow the shorter readings, you will end up with no text at all; . . ."

[21] This is put clearly by Metzger, Commentary, p. xxiv.

[22] Introduction, p. 496.

[23] "Griesbach and the Development of Text Criticism," p. 140.

[24] "The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts: a Rejoinder," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 16 (1914-15), p. 233. The version of this comment cited by Metzger in note 20 above appears to be that of Streeter, who remarks as follows (*The Four Gospels*, p. 131) on Clark's thesis:

> "Once this is stated, its truth is self-evident; any one who has ever sent his own MS. to a typist knows that the accidental omission of words, lines, or sentences is a constant occurrence, while interpolation is not. Of course marginal notes, various readings, etc., do constantly creep into the text of ancient MSS. But while intentional interpolation is quite exceptional, omission--commonly accidental, but sometimes, it would seem, intentional--is a constant phenomenon."

Of course, Streeter's claim that Clark's view is "self-evident" is an overstatement, since many scholars who certainly were familiar with manuscripts have thought that addition was natural. Nevertheless, Streeter's comments show how indecisive such appeals to what we all know or what we can all see in texts prove to be, unless there is some precise statement of evidence given as confirmation. One might compare the statements of Epp concerning "textual criticism by intuition" ("A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism?" *Harvard Theological Review*, 73 [1980], pp. 142-43).

[25] Clark's views are briefly discussed by Metzger, *Text*, pp. 161-63.

[26] *Ibid*., p. 162.

[27] See Colwell, "Genealogical Method," *Studies*, p. 76.

[28] *Text*, p. 163.

[29] *Ibid*. That this term "deliberately" is not just a slip on the part of Metzger is shown by the evidence he cites concerning the text of the *Mahābhārata* in "Recent Trends in the Textual Criticism of the Iliad and the Mahābhārata," *Chapters in the History of New Testament*

UMI

Textual Criticism, New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963), pp. 150-52. There (p. 151) the editor of one of the books of the Indian epic is quoted as saying:

> ". . . probably not one of the some fifty MSS. I have studied for Book 2, nor any of their genealogical ancestors, ever deliberately or intentionally [italics in the original] omitted a single line of text. . . . It appears that no scribe, no redactor, ever knowingly sacrificed a single line which he found in his original."

[30] Perhaps Metzger's own view that addition is natural for scribes has caused him to believe that the only way omission is likely to have occurred is by conscious shortening of the text, and so he views evidence against deliberate omission as being evidence against omission in general.

[31] Colwell, though, had already used his results to make some general statements implying that omission was more frequent than addition. Cf. "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 112: "From this it is clear that the scribe looking for his lost place looked ahead three times as often as he looked back. In other words, the loss of position usually resulted in a loss of text, an omission." And see Colwell and Tune, "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships Between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," Studies, p. 62: "The largest single cause of the singulars in our set of readings [drawn from Jn 11] is the omission or the contraction of words (about 65 per cent of the instances)."

[32] Hoskier's comment on codex 181 cited above in Chapter I, note 62, is again relevant. After finding that almost half the singular readings in 181 are omissions, Hoskier says: "This large number of omissions points to great carelessness and not to 'a shorter text being preferable.'" The extreme application of the preference for shorter readings would lead us to see 181 as a very valuable text, and of course critics have sometimes held that the shorter readings found in our papyri have claims to originality. But such a course forsakes the evidence in behalf of preserving a principle. Surely the evidence is that 181 is careless, and similarly that our six scribes are omitting through carelessness (or deliberately).

[33] See Chapter I, pp. 21-26, and the references there.

[34] In his discussion of the Western text, Hort (*Introduction*, p. 126) notes that "we seem to be in the presence of a vigorous and popular ecclesiastical life, little scrupulous as to the letter of venerated writings, . . ." However, Hort seems to suppose that the lack of scrupulousness would result in additions to the text, rather than in omissions from it.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 134-35. Hobbs, "Introduction," p. 15, describes this desire for fullness as follows: "The idea is that you don't want to lose *anything* that God *might* have said."

[36] On these see Metzger, *Text*, pp. 24-25. In Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. III, p. 144, Gregory notes that such marginal references are found in manuscripts from the fifth century on, as well as in ℵ (due to an early corrector).

[37] Gordon D. Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria," *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), pp. 42-44, has studied the frequency of harmonization to parallels in Lk 10-11, and concludes that P^{75} and B are "comparatively pure" manuscripts.

[38] See Aland, "Die Konsequenzen der neueren Handschriftenfunde für die neutestamentlichen Textkritik," *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967), pp. 181-86.

[39] Note that Griesbach's preference for the shorter reading is qualified: "unless it lacks entirely the authority of the ancient and weighty witnesses." Such a clause gives proper respect to the historical nature of textual criticism, and also allows that later scribes may have copied in ways quite different from the earlier ones.

[40] Here our criteria may conflict: Did the scribes naturally omit an inessential conjunction, or did they add a conjunction for the sake of smoothness? The scribes studied here do both.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The analyses presented here of the six individual papyri cannot, of course, be viewed as exhaustive studies of even the singular readings of these manuscripts. In fact, only a beginning could be made within the available space, a beginning which has isolated certain tendencies within the copying techniques of these six scribes, but has by no means dealt with all the potential issues. The relations which exist between the patterns discovered in the scribes' singulars and those which might be found in their non-singular readings, for instance, should eventually be examined. Further investigation of the relations which may exist between these singulars and the state of Greek at various times, the influence of the Septuagint, the influence of Atticism, and questions of the authors' styles, could also prove to be rewarding.

But already some evidence has been collected which allows us to revise certain principles of transcriptional probability. In the preceding chapter we attempted to formulate a principle which would take into account the fact that all six of our scribes tend to omit. Further sharpening of the generally accepted principle that scribes tend to harmonize may prove useful, for it seems evident that the major influence on our scribes was the immediate context.[1] However, the importance of harmonization to context is not usually recognized clearly enough in textual debates,[2] as Colwell himself notes, and indeed one will occasionally find appeals to principles which directly contravene this established scribal tendency.[3] The examples surveyed in the previous chapters should provide a useful sample of the ways in which such harmonization may occur. Furthermore, we have seen a few examples in connection with P^{72} of scribal change for (as it seems) theological reasons. While the comparative rarity of such examples indicates that revision of the text for theological purposes was not very common, it is thus seen to occur.[4]

Some additional avenues of investigation into scribal habits would include the following:

1. As Colwell already suggested, "a commentary on the singular readings of these papyri and of other important manuscripts would be most valuable."[5] The scribal (and translational) peculiarities of all the major sources for the New Testament text should be catalogued.

2. Perhaps simply as a result of this first line of

inquiry, it would be interesting to see what, if any, differences in copying techniques occurred among various stages in the transmission of the text and among various localities. For the papyri we are, of course, confined to Egypt. But for later periods we have manuscripts from many places, including well-defined scriptoria. Are there patterns which appear to cross all spatial and temporal boundaries, or do scribes behave in quite different fashions?

3. Partially as a control on the methodology presented here, but also simply to gather evidence for scribal habits in the best possible situation, it would be useful to analyze the errors of the scribe of a manuscript whose Vorlage is extant. As noted in Chapter I, D^{abs1}, the ninth-century copy of D (06), seems to be the earliest case known. A study of the mistakes of the scribe of D^{abs1}, perhaps in just a sample of the manuscript's text, might prove valuable.[6] Studies of other manuscripts in relation to their extant Vorlagen might also be significant, although there seem, in fact, to be rather few such cases.[7] But the well-defined families, such as family 1, family 13, and family Π, would offer some potential material for such studies.

4. From a different point of view, it would be useful to compare the same scribe's copying technique--as determined from the singular readings--in several manuscripts. Such

an investigation might well serve to sharpen the method of analysis in order to detect more precisely what is contributed to the copy from the Vorlage and what is contributed by the scribe (that is, the effects of his scribal habits). For such an investigation it would have been fortunate if Tischendorf were correct in his opinion that there was a common scribe who worked on both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.[8] But there are some later scribes who are known to have copied a number of manuscripts, and the work of one of them across several documents could easily be studied.[9]

5. A major difficulty in the isolation of readings created by a particular scribe is the possibility of coincidental agreement in error with other scribes. Colwell was aware of this problem, and suggested that one study a particular manuscript with reference to its textual type, thus assuming that readings supported by manuscripts frmm other textual traditions may nevertheless be creations of the manuscript's scribe.[10] This is certainly plausible when the manuscript does belong to a clearly defined textual type (P^{75} is the best early example), but there remains the formidable task of deciding when an agreement across textual traditions is accidental and when it is due to contamination.[11] It seems, though, that it is possible to gain at least some

information on the likelihood of coincidental agreement by the study of manuscripts whose textual antecedents are clearly established.[12] For instance, one might take a manuscript of family 1, a manuscript of family 13, a manuscript of family Π, and an early papyrus codex, and see whether there are any agreements among some of these against other witnesses, and particularly against other members of the same families.[13] Such studies would give some firm data on the frequency of coincidence in error, and, as a consequence, would permit more precise determinations of what errors are likely or unlikely to occur without genealogical relation. Such a determination would indeed be essential for the eventual extension of the results obtained by an analysis of singular readings to the majority of important textual variants, where two or more readings are non-singular.[14]

FOOTNOTES

[1] As was noted in the preceding chapter, part of the reason for this may have been simply that the text itself was not furnished in the early period with the various reference devices of later times.

[2] There is, for instance, no explicit statement in Metzger's Commentary concerning this sort of assimilation.

[3] As an extreme statement of such contravention see BDF, §492: "For this reason [the use of parallelism in the Gospels] Blass prefers whichever variant readings produce the most exact parallelism." Blass is thus simply a more recent practitioner of the tendency to harmonize to the context. (One example cited, Mt 5:45, is particularly unfortunate, since the reading chosen is unknown in Greek manuscripts, and the versional and Patristic evidence is divided.)

For another appeal to such a principle in a specific case, see Metzger's comment on Mt 7:18 (Commentary, p. 20), where we are told that scribes acted "to relieve the monotonous repetition of the same verb, which also occurs twice in the preceding verse." Here, though, this claim is probably introduced simply to "explain" the editors' decision not to adopt one or both singular readings (of B and א*), and we really have a case of the editors going against the clear scribal tendency (to harmonize, not to relieve monotony) on the basis of the external evidence. (Cf. my comments in my "Response" to Kilpatrick's A Textus Receptus Redivivus?, p. 29.)

[4] Hort, Introduction, p. 282, believed that "deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes" never occurred. But this statement is generally conceded to be indefensible; see Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, Vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), pp. 1-21.

[5] "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 124.

[6] See Chapter I, note 52.

[7] See the comments by Lake and Streeter cited in Chapter I, note 52.

[8] Cf. Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, Vol. III, p. 346 and p. 360. This view seems to have been disposed of by the detailed investigation of Milne and Skeat, Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus, pp. 89-90.

[9] A few cases of such scribes are listed by Duplacy, "Histoire des manuscrits," p. 131 and nn. 5-6. Duplacy refers to Colwell's article on "Scribal Habits," and says: "Les manuscrits grecs du N.T. fourniraient ici matière à plus d'une monographie de scribe ou de scriptorium."

One might extend the investigation to include manuscripts of works other than the books of the New Testament. For instance, Lake, de Zwaan, and Enslin, confirm Zahn's identification of the scribe of 1739 with the scribe of Codex Marcianus 201 of Aristotle ("Codex 1739," p. 142). But, of course, there would be severe methodological problems in dealing with texts with such different textual histories and quantities of attestation.

[10] See "Scribal Habits," Studies, p. 123 (items II and III). Fee's Appendix B (Papyrus, pp. 98-122), which studies P^{66} against the Alexandrian text-type, follows Colwell's advice.

[11] Cf. the comments by Epp concerning Fee's notion of "sub-singular reading" in "Clarification," pp. 162-63.

[12] Colwell's example ("Scribal Habits," Studies, pp. 123-24, item V) of agreements between singular readings of P^{66} and the Revised Standard Version falls into this category, since the textual basis of the Revised Standard Version is known not to have included P^{66}. The modern versions, whose Greek Vorlagen are more or less precisely known, furnish clear evidence of such coincidence; see a few examples cited in Appendix B and, e.g., in Chapter V, note 127.

[13] One example found at random is the agreement between 124 (of family 13) and 827 (of family 1424) in reading συμπνιγουσι εισπορευομεναι at Mk 4:19.

[14] Related to such an investigation would be the sort of analysis undertaken by Fee in his "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," pp. 42-44, where he attempts to characterize the tendencies of textual traditions. His results are quite interesting, and could be made even more persuasive if one knew how to account adequately for the possibility of coincidental agreement in error. Furthermore, of course, Fee's choice of particular sorts of "errors" to examine (such as harmonizations to parallels) presupposes that one has found, perhaps by a study of the singular readings of individual manuscripts, that these are indeed errors which may infect either the archetypes of certain textual types or several representatives of a particular textual tradition.

APPENDIX A

THE CORRECTIONS IN THE PAPYRI

In the following lists are presented all the corrections made in the six papyri here analyzed: P^{45}, P^{46}, P^{47}, P^{66}, P^{72}, and P^{75}. The original reading is given first, then the correction (or, in a few cases, the corrections), and then readings of the other manuscripts. Details concerning the correctors, the nature of the corrections, and the relevant literature, may be found in the respective chapters.

Except for those corrections explicitly noted as by "man 2," etc., all the corrections are either clearly by the original scribe or most probably by the original scribe. Of course, the determination of the hands involved and of the original readings is frequently difficult, and in some cases scholars are in disagreement. Nevertheless, every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and completeness of these lists by utilizing the published editions, photographs, and earlier textual investigations.

Corrections in P^{45}

Matthew

25:42 εδωκατ[ε] P^{45*} B^* : ουκ εδωκατ[ε] $P^{45c(man\ 2)}$ ς $B^{2,3}$ rell

Mark

6:22 ηρωδης P^{45*} : βασιλευς $P^{45c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

Luke

9:36 εορακεν P^{45*} : εορακαν $P^{45c(man\ 1)}$ C^2 L^2 X : εωρακαν B L^* 700 892 : εωρακασιν ς rell : εορακασιν C^* E H V W Θ 0115 al : εορακεισαν G pc : εθεασαν D^* : εθεασαντο D

9:58 ειπεν τις προς [αυ]τον ακολουθησω σοι ειπεν P^{45*} : ειπεν P^{45c} ς rell

John

10:14 γεινωσκουσι με τα εμα P^{45*} P^{66} P^{75vid} ℵ B D^c (εμε pro με) L W pc : γεινωσκει με τα εμα $P^{45c(man\ 1)}$ Epiph (τα εμα προβατα γινωσκει με) : γινωσιν εμε τα εμα D^* : γινωσκομαι υπο των εμων ς rell

11:47 [π]οιησομεν P^{45*} 249 317 423 430 743 : [π]οιουμεν $P^{45c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell : ποιησωμεν 28 397 1093 : ποιωμεν S 33 pc

Acts

5:38 [καταλ]υθηετ[αι] P^{45*} :
[καταλ]υθησετ[αι] $P^{45c(\text{man 1 vid})}$ ς rell

7:12 του π̄[ς̄ (= πατρος)] P^{45*} :
τους π̄[ς̄ (= πατερας)] $P^{45c(\text{man 2})}$ ς rell

7:14 συνγε[νειαν] P^{45*} D : συγγε[νειαν]
$P^{45c(\text{man 1})}$ ς rell (E -νιαν)

13:12 [γ]εγονως P^{45*} : [γ]εγονος $P^{45c(\text{man 1})}$ ς
rell

16:17 [κ]ατακολουθουσαν P^{45*} : [κ]ατακολουθουσα
P^{45c} P^{74} ℵ B D 36 307 431 437 453 808 :
κατακολουθησασα ς rell : παρακολουθησασα
81 242 623

Corrections in P^{46}

Romans

9:4 υιοθ̤εσιαν P^{46*} : υιοθ̤εσια P^{46c} ς rell

9:17 ενδειξο[μαι] P^{46*} F L P 33 242 pc : ενδειξω[μαι] P^{46c} ς rell

9:20 πλασαντι αυ P^{46*} (scribendum erat πλασαντι αυτου ut vid) : πλασαντι P$^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

9:25 ως η ελεγει (= ωσηε λεγει) P^{46*} ς rell (οσηε K) : ως η ελεγεν (= ωση ελεγεν) P$^{46c(man\ 2\ vid)}$: ωσε λεγει P al : ωση λεγει F G

12:1 ουν P^{46*} : ουν (δε 81) υμας P$^{46c(man\ 3)}$ ς rell

12:16 φρονουτες P^{46*} : φρονουντες pri P$^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell

13:5 υποτασεσθε P^{46*} : υποτασσεσθε P^{46c} D F G (ς rell υποτασσεσθαι)

13:12 ενδυσωμεθα ουν P^{46*} : ενδυσωμεθα P^{46c} ℵ* 6 : ενδυσωμεθα δε A B C* D* P 048 1739 pc : και ενδυσωμεθα ς ℵ^{c} C^{3} D^{b,c} rell : και ενδυσωμεθα δε 330

13:14a ενδυσασθαι P^{46*} : ενδυσασθε P$^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

13:14b εις επι̣θυμιαν P^{46*} A C 1 pc : εις επι̣θυμιας P^{46c} ς rell : εν επιθυμειαις F G 1898

14:15 απολ[υε] P^{46*} D^{c} L al : απολλ[υε] P^{46c} ς rell (F G απολλυειν)

Romans

15:23	εχαι P^{46*} : εχειν P^{46c} : εχων pri ς rell
15:26	των α̣γιων P^{46*} 1149 : των α̣γιων των $P^{46c(\text{man } 3)}$ ς rell (D F G των εν ιερουσαλημ αγιων)
15:31	διακονια P^{46*} : διακονια μου $P^{46c(\text{man } 3)}$ ς $D^{b,c}$ rell : δωροφορια μου B D* F G

Hebrews

1:1	πατρασιν P^{46*} ς rell : πατρασιν ημων $P^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$ P^{12} 181 999 1836 1898
2:4	συνεπιμαρτυρουντες P^{46*} : συνεπιμαρτυρουντος P^{46c} ς rell (B* συνμαρτ-, B^{c} συμμαρτ-)
3:6	μεν P^{46*} : εσμεν $P^{46c(\text{man } 3)}$ ς rell
3:7	φωνης μου P^{46*} 1319 : φωνης αυτου $P^{46c(\text{man } 1)}$ ς rell
5:6	επευξ P^{46*} : ιερευς $P^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$ ς rell
5:11	λογος P^{46*} D* P 1319 : ο λογος $P^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$ ς rell
6:1	φερωνεθα P^{46*} : φερωμεθα $P^{46c(\text{man } 1)}$ ς rell (vel φερομεθα)
6:6	εαυτους P^{46*} : εαυτοι̣ς P^{46c} ς rell
7:1a	σαμουηλ P^{46*} : σαλημ $P^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$ ς rell

Hebrews

7:1b τω αβρααμ P^{46*} P : αβρααμ P^{46c} ς rell

7:2 σαμουηλ P^{46*} : σαλημ $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ ς rell

7:11 αρ̣ων P^{46*} : ααρ̣ων $P^{46c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell

7:25 οθεν P^{46*} : οθεν και $P^{46c\text{(man 3)}}$ ς rell

8:2 ανθρωποις P^{46*} : ανθρωπος P^{46c} ς rell

8:5a γρα P^{46*} : γαρ $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ ς rell

8:5b φησει P^{46*} : φησιν $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ ς rell

8:6 νυν P^{46*} B D* : νυνι $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ ς $D^{b,c}$ rell

8:8 λεγει P^{46*} : λεγει [ιδου ημεραι ερχονται λεγει] $P^{46c\text{(man 2 [in mg inf])}}$ ς rell

9:5 κατασκευαζον P^{46*} : κατασκιαζοντα $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ ς rell : κατασκιαζον A P 33 pc (pc -ζων)

9:6 ισασιν P^{46*} : εισιασιν $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ ς rell : εισιεσαν 88

9:8a μηπως P^{46*} D* : μηπω P^{46c} ς rell (1898 pc μηποτε φανερωσθαι)

9:8b οτι P^{46*} : ετι $P^{46c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell (επι D*)

9:14 $\overline{\theta\omega}$ (= θεω) τω ζωντι P^{46*} : $\overline{\theta\omega}$ (= θεω) [καθαριει την συνειδησιν υμων (vel ημων) απο νεκρων εργων εις το λατρευειν θεω ζωντι] (vel similia verba) $P^{46c\text{(man 2 [in mg inf])}}$ ς rell (D* τω θεω τω pro θεω sec)

Hebrews

9:20	υμας P^{46*} 1319 : υμας ο $\overline{θς}$ (= θεος) $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell (ημας pro υμας 1611 pc)
9:22a	νεκ̣ρ̣ω P^{46*} : αιματι $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell
9:22b	και σχεδον P^{46*} : και sec $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell
9:24	προσωπου P^{46*} : προσωπω P^{46c} ς rell
9:25	αιμα[τι] P^{46*} : εν αιμα[τι] P^{46c} ς rell
10:1	θυσιαις P^{46*} A 33 1908 2495 pc : θυσιαις ας $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell : θυσιαις αις D* H L 442 pc : θυσιαις αυτων ας ℵ P
10:10a	προς (et spatium ante του) P^{46*} : προσφορας $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell
10:10b	$\overline{ιης}$ (= ιησους) $\overline{χρς}$ (= χριστος) P^{46*} : $\overline{ιηυ}$ (= ιησου) $\overline{χρυ}$ (= χριστου) P^{46c} ς rell (ιησου 103, του χριστου 1149)
10:22a	[προσερ]χομεθα P^{46*} D K L P 104 326 365 629 1241 1881 al : [προσερ]χωμεθα P^{46c} ς rell
10:22b	γαρ μετα P^{46*} : μετα P^{46c} ς rell (vel μετ)
10:22c	αληθειας P^{46*} : αληθεινης $P^{46c(man\ 3)}$ ς rell
10:24	κατανοωμεν P^{46*} ς rell : κατανοηιωμεν $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$
10:25a	επισυναγωγην P^{46*} ς rell : συναγωγην P^{46c}

Hebrews

10:25b	εθος P^{46*} : καθως εθος $P^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell
10:25c	τι P^{46*} : τισιν $P^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell
10:34a	ημων P^{46*} : υμων P^{46c} ς rell (υμιν 1836)
10:34b	προσδεξασθε P^{46*} 69 440 : προσεδεξασθε $p^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell (547 pc εδεξασθε)
10:36	υπομονην P^{46*} : υπομονης $P^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell
10:37	οσον P^{46*} 6 181 326 436 547 623 pc : οσον οσον $P^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell (D* οθεν pro οσον οσον ο)
10:38	καν P^{46*} : και εαν $P^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell
11:1	ελλεγχος P^{46*} : ελεγχος P^{46c} ς rell
11:10	δημουργος P^{46*} : δημιουργος P^{46c} ς rell
11:12	αμμος P^{46*} D* Ψ : αμμος η παρα το χειλος $p^{46c(\text{man }3)}$ ς rell
11:13	ταυτας P^{46*} : αυτας P^{46c} ς rell : om 642 920
11:21	αυτου P^{46*} : ιωσηφ $P^{46c(\text{man }2)}$ ς rell
11:22	οστων P^{46*} : οστεων $P^{46c(\text{man }1)}$ ς rell
11:29	πειραν P^{46*} : ης πειραν P^{46c} ς rell
11:32	ϊεθαε P^{46*} : ϊεφθαε $P^{46c(\text{man }1)}$ ς rell
11:34	επι P^{46*} : απο $P^{46c(\text{man }1)}$ ς rell

Hebrews

11:35 απολυσιν P^{46*} : απολυτρωσιν $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$
ς rell

12:4a οπου P^{46*} : ουπω P^{46c} ς rell

12:4b αντικατεστησ̣εν P^{46*} : αντικατεστηκεν
P^{46c} : αντικατεστητε ς L** rell :
αντεκατεστητε L* 33 69 81 al :
αντεστητε K 38 337

12:6-7 κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος) παιδευει P^{46*} : κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος)
παιδευει [μαστιγοι δε παντα υιον ον
παραδεχεται εις παιδειαν υπομενετε ως υιοις
υμιν προσφερεται ο θεος τις γαρ υιος ον ου
παιδευει] (vel similia verba)
$P^{46c(man\ 2\ [in\ mg\ inf])}$ ς rell

12:8 ο̣ις (vel ε̣ις) P^{46*} : ης $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell

12:10 μεν P^{46*} : μεν γαρ $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell

12:14 ουδει P^{46*} : ουδεις $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell

12:19 φωνην P^{46*} : φωνη P^{46c} ς rell

12:23 θ̅ω̅ (= θεω) P^{46*} : θ̅ω̅ (= θεω) παντων
$P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell

12:25 τον ante επι P^{46*} ς $ℵ^{c}$ K L P Ψ pm : τον
ante χρηματιζοντα $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ℵ* A C D I
048 0121b 33 81 1739 pc

Hebrews

12:26 ει η P^{46*} : η P^{46c} : ου η ς rell : ου 0121b 1739 pc

12:28 εχομεν P^{46*} ℵ K P Ψ 6 33 69 104 326 442 al : εχωμεν $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

13:6 λεγει P^{46*} : λεγειν $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ Ψ 0121b 1739 : ημας λεγειν ς rell : λεγειν ημας D

13:8 σημερο̣ν P^{46*} 69 : και σημερο̣ν P^{46c} ς rell

13:9 ποι̣κιλαις P^{46*} : ποι̣κιλαις και P^{46c} ς rell

13:11 [καιεται] P^{46*} Ψ : κατα[καιεται] P^{46c} ς rell : καταναλισκονται D*

13:18a καλ|ην P^{46*vid} : κα|λην $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$: καλην ς rell

13:18b πασι P^{46*} : εν πασι P^{46c} ς rell : εν παντι 33

13:21a παντι P^{46*} : ε̣ν̣ παντι P^{46c} ς rell

13:21b ι̅η̅ς̅ (= ιησους) χ̅ρ̅ς̅ (= χριστος) P^{46*} : ι̅η̅υ̅ (= ιησου) χ̅ρ̅υ̅ (= χριστου) P^{46c} ς rell

13:22 απεστειλα P^{46*} D 424 1319 pc : επεστειλα $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

13:23 απο $P^{46*(?)}$: απολελῦ (vid = απολελυμενον) $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

13:24 υμω̅ (= υμων) P^{46*} : υμω̅ (= υμων) και παντας τους αγιους $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell (88 om παντας, 623 τους φιλους ημων pro παντας)

Hebrews

13:25 υ $P^{46*(?)}$: υμων $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ ς rell (D* των αγιων, 1241 ημων)

1 Corinthians

3:20 αυτων P^{46*} : των P^{46c} ς rell

4:14 νουθετη P^{46*} : νουθετω $P^{46c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell : νουθετων P^{11vid} ℵ A C P 6 33 104 1739 pc

6:2 κρενε[ται] P^{46*} : κρεινε[ται] P^{46c} ς rell

6:14 εξεγειρει P^{46*vid} P^{11} A D* P 88 1241^{supp} pc : εξεγερει $P^{46c\text{(man 1 vel man 2?)}}$ ς ℵ C D^{c} K L Ψ pm : εξηγειρεν $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ B 6 424** 1739

7:15 η P^{46*} ℵ* F G P 3 69 489* pc : η η P^{46c} ς ℵ^{c} rell (η και η 1739)

7:17 εμερισεν P^{46*} ς ℵ^{c} rell : εμερικεν $P^{46c\text{(man 1)}}$: μεμερικεν ℵ* B 81 1739 pc

8:7 εσθιουσιν P^{46*} : εσθιουσι P^{46c} : εσθιουσι(ν) ς rell

8:9 εξουσια P^{46*} : η εξουσια $P^{46c\text{(man 2)}}$ ς rell

8:10 ειδωλαθυτα P^{46*} : ειδωλοθυτα $P^{46c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell

1 Corinthians

10:2 εβαπτιζοντο P^{46*} : εβαπτισαντο $P^{46c(man 1)}$ ς rell : εβαπτισθησαν ℵ A C D F G Ψ 33 69 81 104 al

10:21 τρπεζης P^{46*} : τραπεζης pri $P^{46c(man 2)}$ ς rell

10:25a εσθιετε P^{46*} : εσθειετε P^{46c} : εσθ(ε)ιετε ς rell

10:25b συνιδησιν P^{46*vid} : συνειδησιν P^{46c} : συν(ε)ιδησιν ς rell

11:5 την P^{46*} : τη P^{46c} ς rell : om D* F G

12:20 μελη P^{46*} B D* K 6 1241^{supp} pc : μεν μελη $P^{46c(man 3)}$ ς $D^{b,c}$ rell

12:26 πα̅|τα (= παντα) sec P^{46*} : πα̅|τα (= παντα) τα sec P^{46c} ς rell

13:5 το εαυτης P^{46*} 436 : το μη εαυτης $P^{46c(man 2)}$ B : τα εαυτης ς rell

13:12 προσοπον P^{46*} : προσωπον pri $P^{46c(man 1)}$ ς rell

14:9 αυλουμενον P^{46*} : λαλουμενον $P^{46c(man 1)}$ ς rell

14:10 φωνων P^{46*} : γενη φωνων $P^{46c(man 3)}$ ς rell

14:20 ται P^{46*} : ταις pri $P^{46c(man 1)}$ ς rell

14:29a προφηται P^{46*} : προφηται δε $P^{46c(man 1)}$ ς rell

1 Corinthians

14:29b λαλειτωσαν P^{46*} : λαλειτωσαν και $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

15:2 κατεχειν ει κατεχετε (et spatium ante κατεχειν) P^{46*} : ει κατεχετε P^{46c} ς rell : οφειλετε (F G οφιλεται) κατεχειν D* F G : γινωσκετε 1311

15:17 εσται P^{46*} : εστε P^{46c} ς rell

15:24 $\overline{\text{παρι}}$ (= πατρι) P^{46*} ς rell (πατρι vel $\overline{\text{πρι}}$) : $\overline{\text{παρ}}$ (= πατηρ) P^{46c} : $\overline{\text{πνι}}$ (= πνευματι) F

15:34 αμαρτανητε P^{46*} : αμαρτανετε $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

16:1 ει P^{46*} : εις $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

16:4 πορευονται P^{46*vid} : πορευσονται $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

16:7 παρδω P^{46*} : παροδω $P^{46c(man\ 4)}$ ς rell

2 Corinthians

1:1 του (ante ουση) P^{46*} : τη sec $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

1:11 υμων (ad fin) P^{46*} B D^c F K L P 614 629 630 1241 pm : ημων (ad fin) $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ς D* rell

1:14 ειπενγνωτε P^{46*} : επεγνωτε P^{46c} ς rell

2 Corinthians

1:19 σιλβανου P^{46*} D F G : σιλουανου $P^{46c(man\ 3?)}$ ς rell

3:6 αποκτενει P^{46*} rell : αποκτεννει $P^{46c(man\ 2)}$ ℵ F (-ηννει) G K P Ψ 33 69** 181 1739 al : αποκτεινει ς B 462 547 pc

4:2 απειπαμεθα P^{46*} ς rell : απειπομεθα $P^{46c(man\ 4)}$

6:12 στενοχωρειθε P^{46*} : στενοχωρεισθε pri P^{46c} ς rell

6:14 δικαιοσυνης P^{46*} D* F G Ψ 330 : δικαιοσυνη P^{46c} ς rell D^c

7:8 βλεπων P^{46*} : βλεπω P^{46c} ς rell

10:3 περιπατουτας P^{46*} : περιπατουτες P^{46c} : περιπατουντας F G : περιπατουντες ς rell

10:6 υπακοη P^{46*} : η υπακοη P^{46c} ς rell

10:15 τα μετρα P^{46*} : τα αμετρα P^{46c} ς rell

12:5 ασθενεαις P^{46*vid} : ασθενειαις $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (D* τοις ασθενημασιν)

Ephesians

1:18 ημας P^{46*} : υμας P^{46c} ς rell (F G ινα οιδατε pro εις το ειδεναι υμας)

2:12 εν pri P^{46*} ς D^c rell : om P^{46c} ℵ A B D* F G 33 823 1739

Ephesians

2:12 πολιτειας P^{46*} ς B^{*} ipse vel 2 corr ex -τιας rell : πολειτιας P^{46c} : πολειτειας F G : πολιτιας $B^{*,3}$ P al

4:15 ο P^{46*} D 442 : ος P^{46c} ς rell

5:5 καθαρτ[ος] P^{46*} : ακαθαρτ[ος] $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

6:12 πρους τους P^{46*} : προς τους P^{46c} ς rell

6:22 καρδιας ημων P^{46*} : καρδιας υμων P^{46c} ς rell

Galatians

1;6 ημας P^{46*} H 33 pc : υμας P^{46c} ς rell

1:14 περισσοτερον P^{46*} : περισσοτερως $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

2:4 εν τω P^{46*} : εν P^{46c} ς rell

2:12 υπεστελεν P^{46*} : υπεστελλεν P^{46c} ς rell (απεστελλεν 255, υπεβαλλεν 1610)

4:11 εκοπισα P^{46*} : εκοπιασα $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ 1739 1881 : εκοπειακα F G : κεκοπιακα ς rell

4:16 υμε̣ν P^{46*} : υμε̣ι̣ν P^{46c} ς rell

4:22 λευθερας P^{46*} : ελευθερας $P^{46c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (ℵ -ριας)

Galatians

5:17 π̅ν̅α̅ (= πνευμα) P^{46*} ς rell : το π̅ν̅α̅ (= πνευμα) $P^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$

Philippians

1:7a του φρονειν P^{46*} L 623* : τουτο φρονειν P^{46c} ς rell

1:7b εχιν P^{46*} : εχε̣ιν P^{46c} ς rell

1:20 ζως P^{46*} : ζωης $P^{46c(\text{man } 2)}$ ς rell

1:23 εν χ̅ω̅ (= χριστω) P^{46*} inceperat : εχων $P^{46c(\text{man } 1)}$ ς rell (εχω 81 917)

3:14 σκοπων P^{46*} (κατασκοπῶν 69 93 104 483) : σκοπον P^{46c} ς rell

3:15 φρωνωμεν $P^{46*\text{vid}}$: φρονωμεν P^{46c} ς rell : φρονουμεν ℵ L 326 1241^{supp} pc

3:18 εχρους P^{46*} : εχθρους P^{46c} ς rell (εκθρους F G, εκχθρους A)

Colossians

1:7 συνδολου P^{46*} : συνδουλου $P^{46c(\text{man } 4)}$ ς rell

1:20 δι ατου P^{46*} : δι αυτου sec P^{46c} ς $D^{b,c}$ rell : om B D* F G I L 81 104 1739 al

1:28 νουθετουνθες P^{46*} : νουθετουντες P^{46c} ς rell

Colossians

3:3 απεϑανετε P^{46*} ς rell :

απεϑανατε P^{46c}(man 2)

Corrections in P^{47}

Revelation

9:20 χαλκα P^{47*} ς rell (104 pm om plane και τα χαλκα) : χαλκεα $P^{47c(man\ 1)}$ ℵ 2351^{comm} (-αια)

10:4 βρονται sec P^{47*} C it^{gig} $cop^{sa\ ms}$: ζ̅ (= επτα) βρονται $P^{47c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (βροται 2058)

11:10 αυτους P^{47*} 1876 2015 2043 2082 : τους P^{47c} ς rell

11:17 ο θ̅ς̅ (= θεος) P^{47*} : ο κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος) $P^{47c(man\ 1)}$ cop : κυριε ς rell : κυριος ℵ 598* : om 141

12:16 γη την P^{47*} : γη τη $P^{47c(man\ 1)}$ ς ℵ A C P 046 051 1678 1778 2080 pm

13:3 εθαραπευθη P^{47*} : εθεραπευθη $P^{47c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (2077 -θει)

13:16 χαρ[α]γ̣ματα P^{47*} 046 051 pm : χαρ[α]γ̣μα P^{47c} ς ℵ A C P 1678 1778 2080 pm

14:10 μου P^{47*} : του post θ̅υ̅ (= θεου) $P^{47c(man\ 1)}$ ς ℵ A C P 046 051 1678 1778 2080 pm

14:11 προσκυνουντας P^{47*} : προσκυνουντες P^{47c} ς rell

Revelation

15:3 μωσεως P^{47*} ς P 2015 2080 al : μωυσεως P^{47c} ℵ A 046 051 pm

16:11 εβλασφημησαν P^{47*} ς ℵ A C P 046 051 pm : εβλασφημουν P^{47c} 1678 1778 2080 it^{gig} cop$^{sa,bo^{ms}}$

16:14 αυτ/ et scripturus erat /ους P^{47*vid} : αυ/τους P^{47c} : αυτους ς rell

16:15 ι̣δ[ου] P^{47*} ς rell : ει̣δ[ου] P^{47c} : δου 2065

Corrections in P^{66}

John

1:9 πανταν P^{66*} : παντα P^{66c} ς rell

1:15a κρα(γεν scripturus erat) P^{66*} : κεκραγεν
P$^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (εκεκραγε 13)

1:15b οπισω P^{66*} Δ (Ο· πισω sic) 1646* :
ο οπισω P^{66c} ς 1646^{c} rell

1:19a προς αυτον om P^{66*} ς P^{75} C^{3} rell : [προς
αυτον] post λευειτας P$^{66c\,vid}$ A X Θ Ψ f^{13} al :
προς αυτον post απεστειλαν B C* 33 892^{c} 1010
al : προς αυτον post ιουδαιοι 954

1:19b συς ει P^{66*} : συ τις ει P^{66c} ς rell :
συ τι ει G : οτι συ ει 565

1:22a τις ει P^{66*} ς rell : συ τις ει P^{66c} P^{75} E*
157 it$^{c,f,r^{1}}$ arm

1:22b τι εγεις P^{66*} : τι λεγεις P^{66c} ς rell

1:25 ηλιας P^{66*} ς rell : ηλειας P^{66c} P^{75} B L 083

1:27a ουκ ειμι P^{66*} P^{75} ℵ C L 063 f^{13} 33 565 al :
ουκ ειμι εγω P^{66c} B N W^{supp} X Ψ 083 0113 pc
(ουκ ειμι αξιος εγω 1241) : εγω ουκ ειμι ς rell

1:27b τον τον P^{66*} : τον P^{66c} ς rell

1:33 βπτιζειν P^{66*} : βαπτιζειν P^{66c} ς rell

1:35a τη παυριον P^{66*} : τη επαυριον P^{66c} ς rell

1:35b ιωα[ν]νεις P^{66*vid} : ιωα[ν]νης P^{66c} ς rell :
ιωανης B

John

1:36 θ̅υ̅ (= θεου) ο αι̣[ρ]ω̣ν την αμαρτιαν του κοσμου̣
P^{66*} C* 892 1241 pc (W^{supp} τας αμαρτιας)
it$^{a,aur,ff^2}$: θ̅υ̅ (= θεου) P^{66c} ς rell

1:38 μθερμηνευομενον P^{66*} : μεθερμηνευομενον P^{66c}
P^{75} ℵ^{c} A B C L N W^{supp} X Ψ 063 33 892 1424 al :
ερμηνευομενον ς ℵ* rell (ερμηνευεται et om
λεγεται f^{1} pc)

1:42 ηγαγεν P^{66*} P^{75} ℵ B L pc (-γον K) : ουτος
ηγαγεν P^{66c} G f^{1} pc arm Epiph : και ηγαγεν
ς rell : ηγαγεν δε 579

1:45 ισηφ P^{66*} : ιωσηφ P^{66c} ς rell

1:46 φιλιππος P^{66*} ς rell : ο φιλιππος P^{66c}
P^{75vid} B L 33 579 pc

1:49 αληθως ο υιος P^{66*} 1241 : ο υιος P^{66c} ς rell

2:2 δε P^{66*} 440 579 1071 it : δε και P^{66c} ς rell

2:3 τω ι̅υ̅ (= ιησου) P^{66*} : του ι̅υ̅ (= ιησου) P^{66c}
ς rell : αυτου U 700

2:9 ησαν P^{66*} : ηδεισαν P^{66c} ς rell

2:10 εαρτι P^{66*} : εως αρτι P^{66c} ς rell :
εως του νυν Γ

2:11a ταυτην πρωτην P^{66*} it^{f,q} (ℵ* add πρωτην post
γαλιλαιας) : ταυτην P^{66c} ς rell

John

2:11b αρχην εποιησεν P^{66*} it^{q} (1241 1424 praem
την) : εποιησεν αρχην P^{66c} P^{75vid} A B L N
Θ Ψ 083 f^{1} 33 565 al : εποιησεν την αρχην
ϛ rell

2:11c εις σαυτον P^{66*} : εις αυτον P^{66c} ϛ rell
(αυτω pro εις αυτον 348 1279)

2:12a αδελφοι P^{66*} P^{75} B L Ψ 083^{vid} 0162 pc it^{c} :
αδελφοι αυτου P^{66c} ϛ rell

2:12b μ.αθηται P$^{66*(?)}$: μαθηται P$^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ϛ rell

2:12c εμειναν P^{66*} ϛ P^{75} rell : εμειναιν P^{66c} A Λ
f^{1} 565 al (1241 εμενεν) it^{b} cop$^{sa^{mss},bo,ach^{2}}$

2:13 και εγγυς δε P^{66*} : και εγγυς P^{66c} ϛ rell :
εγγυς δε ℵ

2:15a και τα P^{66*} : τα τε P^{66c} ϛ rell : τα ℵ*

2:15b το κερμα P^{66*} ϛ rell : τα κερματα P^{66c} P^{75}
B L W^{supp} X 083 0162 33 pc it^{b,q}

2:20 ουτος και P^{66*} : ουτος και συ P^{66c} ϛ rell

2:22 ο̄/ν (= ον/ν) P^{66*} : ο̄/ (= ον) P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ B
L 050 083 pc : ω ϛ rell (ο 1241)

2:25a χριαν P^{66*} W^{supp} : χρειαν P^{66c} ϛ rell

2:25b περι P^{66*} Or : περι του P^{66c} ϛ rell

3:2a ουτος/ουτος P^{66*} : /ουτος P^{66c} ϛ rell

3:2b ραμβει P^{66*} : ραββει P^{66c} ϛ rell

3:2c μη P^{66*} L 239 470* : μη η P^{66c} ϛ rell

John

3:3 υμιν P^{66*} 579 713 : σοι $P^{66c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell

3:4 λεγι P^{66*} W^{supp} : λεγει P^{66c} ς rell

3:8a πνευ(μα scripturus erat) P^{66*} : $\overline{\text{πνα}}$ (= πνευμα) $P^{66c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell

3:8b γενημενος P^{66*} : γεγεννημενος P^{66c} ς rell (H 69 -ν-)

3:11 εωρακεμεν P^{66*vid} : εωρακαμεν P^{66c} ς rell : εορακαμεν P^{75} E G H K L W^{supp} Θ pm

3:16 ηγαπα P^{66*vid} : ηγαπησεν $P^{66c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell

3:17 κοσμον pri P^{66*} : κοσμον ινα κρινη τον κοσμον $P^{66c\text{(in mg sup)}}$ ς rell

3:19 φως pri P^{66*} 472 : το φως P^{66c} ς rell

3:21 ο P^{66*} : ο δε P^{66c} ς rell

3:26 ην P^{66*} : ηλθον P^{66c} ς B^3 rell (ηλθαν P^{75} B* W^{supp})

3:28 απ.ταλμενος P^{66*}(?) : απεσταλμενος P^{66c} ς rell

3:29 τη νυμφην P^{66*} : την νυμφην P^{66c} ς rell

3:31a ανοθ ερχομενος P^{66*} : ανοθεν ερχομενος P^{66c} W^{supp} (ανωθεν ς rell)

3:31b και εκ της γης λαλει om P^{66*} : [και] ε̣κ τ̣ης γης λαλει $P^{66c\text{(in mg inf)}}$ ς rell

3:31c ο ων εκ του ουρανου P^{66*} : ο εκ του ουρανου ερχομενος P^{66c} ς rell

3:33 εσφρα[γι]σεν P^{66*} ς rell : τουτον εσφρα[γι]σεν P^{66c1} : ουτος εσφρα[γι]σεν P^{66c2}

John

3:34 μερους P^{66*} U 12 40 63 253 254 945 1223 :
μετρου P^{66c} ς rell

3:36 αλλα οργη P^{66*vid} : αλλ η οργη P^{66c} ς rell

4:1 ο $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ (= ιησους) P^{66*vid} ℵ D Θ Λ 086 f^1 565 1010
1241 al : ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ (= κυριος) P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell :
om 047

4:5 ιω(σηφ scripturus erat) P^{66*} :
ιακωβ $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

4:6a ουν P^{66*} : ο ουν P^{66c} ς rell : ο δε V pc :
ο 69

4:6b εκαθιζετο P^{66*} : εκαθεζετο P^{66c} ς rell

4:6c τη γη P^{66*} 1241 : τη πηγη P^{66c} ς rell :
την πηγην L 1321 : της πηγης 2768

4:9a σαμαριτις P^{66*} ℵ C D L W^{supp} Θ 050 083 pc :
σαμαρειτις P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

4:9b παρα μου P^{66*} : παρ εμου P^{66c} ς rell

4:9c ετεις P^{66*} (ετις W^{supp}) : αιτεις P^{66c} ς rell

4:9d ετεις πειν P^{66*} : πειν αιτεις P^{66c} ς rell
(vel πιν vel πιειν)

4:10 η ειδεις P^{66*} : ει ηδεις P^{66c} ς rell :
ει ειδεις A

4:11a αυτη P^{66*} : αυτω $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

4:11b βα $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ (= θεου) P^{66*} : βαθυ P^{66c} ς rell

4:12 υιοι P^{66*} : οι υιοι P^{66c} ς rell

John

4:15 διψησω P^{66*} D : διψω P^{66c} ς rell

4:21 κοσμω P^{66*vid} : ορι $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

4:23a τοιου.τους $P^{66*(?)}$: τοιουτους $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

4:23b αυτω P^{66*} $\aleph^{*}$ 124^{c} 254 pc : αυτον $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς $\aleph^{c}$ rell (αυτων Γ)

4:25 οιδα P^{66*} ς P^{75} $\aleph^{*}$ rell : οιδαμεν P^{66c} $\aleph^{c}$ L N Λ f^{13} 33 1071 1241 al

4:29 ιδετε P^{66*vid} ς rell : ιδεται $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$

4:37 αλος P^{66*} : αλλος pri P^{66c} ς rell

4:39a (ειπο)υσης $P^{66*(?)}$ 185 $syr^{c,p}$; ματυρουσης P^{66c} : μαρτυρουσης ς rell (Θ -σις)

4:39b οσα P^{66*} : οσα εποιησα P^{66c} ς rell (α pro οσα P^{75} ℵ B C* L pc)

4:42 αυτος P^{66*vid} 2768 it^{r1} : ουτος P^{66c} ς rell (ουτως H)

4:47 $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ (= ιησους) P^{66*vid} ς rell : ο $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ (= ιησους) P^{66c1} ℵ Θ f^{13pt} 472 : $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ (= ιησους) P^{66c2} ς rell : om ιησους 1321

4:48a ειπεν P^{66*} 083 237 $syr^{c,p}$: ειπεν ουν P^{66c} ς rell : ειπεν δε 1010 1293

4:48b προς σαυτον P^{66*} : προς αυτον P^{66c} ς rell

4:51 παις αυτου P^{66*} P^{75} ℵ A B C W^{supp} pc arm Or : υιος σου P^{66c} D K L N U Π 33 579 892 1071 1241 al : παις σου ς rell (add ο υιος αυτου f^{13})

John

4:52 ειπον P^{66*} 0125 2145 it^{e} $syr^{c,p}$: ειπον ουν P^{66c} P^{75} B C L N W^{supp} Ψ f^{1} 33 565 579 1010 1241 al : και ειπον ς rell (ειπαν D)

5:2a η εστιν λεγομενη P^{66*} : η επιλεγομενη P^{66c} ς P^{75} $ℵ^{c}$ rell (τη pro η W^{supp}) : η λεγομενη D f^{1} 33 565 579 pc : το λεγομενον ℵ* : διερμηνευομενη 1321

5:2b βηδσαιδαν P^{66*} : βηδσαιδα P^{66c} : βηθσαιδα P^{75} B W^{supp} 0125 pc $it^{aur,c}$ vg syr^{h} cop eth Tert : βησσαιδα Ψ : βηθεσδα ς rell : βηθζαθα ℵ 33 it^{l} : βηζαθα L it^{e} : βελζεθα D $it^{a,d,r^{1}}$

5:5 ετη $\overline{\lambda\eta}$ P^{66*} : $\overline{\lambda\eta}$ ετη P^{66c} ς P^{75c} (P^{75*} om ετη) rell (vel τριακοντα και [om ς pm] οκτω ετη) : $\overline{\mu}$ και $\overline{\eta}$ ετη W^{supp} : ετη om 579

5:6 πολυν P^{66*} ℵ 253 1321 2768 it^{e} : πολυν ηδη P^{66c} ς rell (P^{75} f^{1} 213 482 565 pon ηδη post χρονον, 579 pon ηδη ante πολυν)

5:9 ην δε P^{66*vid} : και pri $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell : και pri om ℵ*

5:11a σοι P^{66*vid} : μοι P^{66c} ς rell : om 892

5:11b αραν P^{66*} : αρον P^{66c} ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell : αραι ℵ*

5:16a δια το/(υτο scripturus erat) P^{66*} : δια /τουτο $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (δια ταυτα 473)

5:16b το P^{66*} : οτι P^{66c} ς rell

John

5:19 εα μη P^{66*} : εαν μη P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell : αν μη ℵ B

5:20 φιλι P^{66*} : φιλει P^{66c} ς rell : αγαπα D

5:22 ου P^{66*} 1241 : ουδε P^{66c} ς rell

5:23 ο P^{66*} : ο μη P^{66c} ς rell

5:28a παντες P^{66*} : παντες σοι P^{66c1vid} : παντες οι P^{66c2} ς rell

5:28b εν τω ερημω P^{66*} : εν τοις μνημειοις P$^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (μνημασιν 213)

5:29a εκπορευσωνται P^{66*} : εκπορευσονται P^{66c} ς rell (εισπορ- 1194) : εξελευσονται D W

5:29b και οι (post ζωης) P^{66*} W : οι P^{66c} B it$^{a,e,ff^2}$: οι δε ς P^{75} rell

5:33a υμις P^{66*} : υμεις P^{66c} ς rell

5:33b και. P$^{66*(?)}$: και P$^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

5:36a εργα pri P^{66*} : εργα α P^{66c} ς rell

5:36b κ(αι scripturus erat) P^{66*} : μοι P$^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

5:36c αυτα ταυτα P^{66*} : αυτα αυτα P^{66c} ς rell : αυτα G 33 713 1241

5:36d απεισταλκεν P^{66*vid} : απεσταλκεν P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell : απεστειλεν D f^{1pt} f^{13pt} 28 472 565 1241 al

5:37 ποτε P^{66*} : πωποτε P^{66c} ς rell : om 047 660

John

5:39 και αρ P^{66*vid} : και γαρ $P^{66c1vid}$: και P^{66c2} ς rell : δε 1223

5:43a εγω δε P^{66*} : εγω P^{66c} ς rell

5:43b με P^{66*} ς rell : om P^{66c}

5:44 ζητιται P^{66*} (Θ ζητιτε) : ζητειται P^{66c} ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell : ζητει Δ : ζητουντες ℵ* 2768 pc

5:45 δοκιτε P^{66*} : δοκειτε P^{66c} ς rell

6:1 της τιβεριαδος om P^{66*} 1546 : της τιβεριαδος P^{66c} ς rell (579 om της)

6:2 εωρων P^{66*} ς rell (mss pc habent εωρουν, εωρασι, εωρακασι, εωρακεν) : εθεωρουν P^{66c} B D L N Ψ 33 892 1010 1241 al : εθεωρων P^{75} A Θ f^{13} : θεωρουντες et om οτι W

6:5a οφαλμους P^{66*} : οφθαλμους P^{66c} ς rell

6:5b οχλος πολυς P^{66*} ℵ D Θ 892 pc : πολυς οχλος P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

6:5c ερχετε P^{66*vid} : ερχεται $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

6:7a δηριων P^{66*} : δηναριων P^{66c} ς rell

6:7b αυτο.ις P^{66*}(?) : αυτοις $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell : αυτους 472 : om ℵ it^{ff^2} cop^{bo} Chr

6:9a ο̤ς̤/σεχει P^{66*} : ο̤ς̤/ εχει P^{66c} A B D* G U W Λ Ψ f^{13} 579 892 1241 2768 al : ο εχει ς D^{2} rell

6:9b τι εστιν ταυτα P^{66*} 473* it^{e} : ταυτα τι εστιν P^{66c} ς rell (εισιν 713, D* om τι)

John

6:10 οι om P^{66*} D L N W Ψ f^{1} 33 565 579 892 1010
1071 1241 al : οι P^{66c} ς rell

6:11 ευχαριστησαςς (et εδωκεν scripturus erat) P^{66*} :
ευχαριστησας εδωκεν P^{66c}(man 1 [ε ex c]) P^{28} N
Γ 40 69 71 579 1071 1241 pc : ευχαριστησας
διεδωκεν ς P^{75} rell (δεδωκεν 28 pc) :
ευχαριστησεν και εδωκεν ℵ D (ηυχαρ-)

6:40 τουτο γαρ εστιν το θελημα om P^{66*} : τουτο γαρ
ε̣[στιν το] θ̣ελημα P^{66c}(in mg sup) ς rell (γαρ
ℵ A B C D N W Θ f^{1} f^{13} 33 565 579 892 2768 al,
δε ς rell, om P^{75} T [et τουτον pro τουτο] 713)

6:40a πιστεων P^{66*} : πιστευων P^{66c} ς rell

6:40b εχη P^{66*} ς P^{75} rell : εχει P^{66c} E H K M U Γ Λ al

6:41 αρατος P^{66*vid} : αρτος P^{66c} ς rell

6:42a οτι P^{66*vid} $cop^{sa^{ms}}$: ουχ P^{66c} ς rell :
ουχι P^{75} B T

6:42b $\overline{\pi\rho\alpha}$ (= πατερα) ϗ (= και) P^{66*vid} : τον $\overline{\pi\rho\alpha}$
(= πατερα) ϗ (= και) P^{66c} ς $\aleph^{c}$ rell : και τον
πατερα ℵ* (om και την μητερα cum W)

6:42c μητεραν P^{66*} : μητερα P^{66c} ς rell

6:44 εν τη P^{66*} rell : τη P^{66c} ς P^{75} ℵ Δ Θ pc
$it^{aur,e}$ vg^{st}

6:47 α.μην pri P^{66*}(?) : αμην pri P^{66c} ς rell

6:51 ο ζων ο ε. P^{66*}(?) : ο ζων ο εκ P^{66c} ς rell

John

6:52 ουτος δουναι P^{66*} : ουτος δουναι ημιν P^{66c} U 579 1170 1241 1242 : ουτος ημιν δουναι ς rell : ημιν ουτος δουναι ℵ C f^{1} 565 pc : ουτος ημιν et δουναι post σαρκα D K Θ Π f^{13} 1010 al : ουτος et δουναι ημιν post σαρκα 69 : ημιν ουτος et δουναι post σαρκα 2768 : ημιν δουναι 047

6:54 ο τρωνων μου P^{66*} : ο τρωγων μου την σαρκα κ/ (= και) πινων μου P^{66c} ς rell (Δ* pon μου pri post σαρκα, D σαρκαν et αυτου bis pro μου)

6:55 αληθως bis P^{66*} ς rell (ℵ* D αληθως pri tantum, ℵ* om εστιν - αληθως, D om και - ποσις) : αληθης bis P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ^{c} B C K L T W Π Ψ f^{1} 565 892 1010 1241 1424 al : αληθης et αληθως ℵ^{cb} f^{13} pc

6:58 καταβαινων P^{66*} ℵ* : καταβας P^{66c} ς ℵ^{c} rell

6:60a των μαθητω̄ (= μαθητων) P^{66*vid} : ακουσαντες εκ P$^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (D it^{d,q} syr^{c} pon ακουσαντες post μαθητων αυτου)

6:60b μαθητων P^{66*} : μαθητων αυτου P^{66c} ς rell

6:61 σκαδαλιζει P^{66*} : σκανδαλιζει P^{66c} ς rell

6:63a πνευ(μα scripturus erat) P^{66*vid} : $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ (= πνευμα) P$^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

6:63b σαρξ δε P^{66*vid} : σαρξ P^{66c} ς rell

John

6:63c ρημα P^{66*} : ρηματα P^{66c} ς rell

6:64a οι μη πιστευσ(αντες scripturus erat) P^{66*vid} : οι ου πιστευουσι P$^{66c(man 1)}$ ς rell

6:64b τινες εισιν οι μη πιστευοντες και om P^{66*} 1344* it^{e} syr^{c,s} : τινες εισιν οι μη πιστευοντες κ/ (= και) P$^{66c(in mg sup)}$ ς 1344^{mg} rell (ℵ 1071 pc om μη, 124 pc πιστευσαντες, 1009 add εις αυτον post πιστευοντες)

6:68 πε.τρος P$^{66*(?)}$: πετρος P$^{66c(man 1)}$ ς rell

6:70a του P^{66*} : τους P^{66c} ς ℵ^{c} rell : om ℵ* Epiph

6:70b διαβος P^{66*} : διαβολος P^{66c} ς rell

7:4a αυτο εν παρρησια P^{66*} B W pc it^{d} : αυτος εν παρρησια P^{66c} ς P^{75} E^{c} rell : εν παρρησια αυτος D^{2} (D* αυτο) θ f^{13} : αυτον εν παρρησια E* 253 1093

7:4b εινα P^{66*} : ειναι P^{66c} ς rell : ει f^{13}

7:8 αναβα(ινω scripturus erat) P^{66*} : αναβηται P$^{66c(man 1)}$ ς rell

7:9a ταυ P^{66*} : ταυτα P^{66c} ς rell

7:9b εμεινε̄ (= εμεινεν) P^{66*} : εμεινεν ε̄ (= εν) P^{66c} ς rell (D εις την γαλιλαιαν pro εν τη γαλιλαια)

7:12 εν P^{66*} D θ it arm : πολυς εν P^{66c} P^{75} B L T W X 0180^{vid} 33 1241 pc it^{b,q} : πολυς post γογγυσμος ς rell it^{f,j} vg

John

7:13 ελει P^{66*} : ελαλει P^{66c} ς rell

7:14a μεσαζουσης P^{66*} D Θ f^{1} f^{13} 22 565 Epiph : μεσουσης P^{66c} ς rell : μεσης ουσης W it

7:14b αναβη P^{66*} : αναιβη P^{66c} ς rell

7:18a μψᾱ/τος (= μψαντος) P^{66*} : πεμψᾱ/τος (= πεμψαντος) P^{66c} ς rell

7:18b με P^{66*} : αυτον P^{66c} ς rell

7:19 αποκτιναι P^{66*} W Θ : αποκτειναι P^{66c} ς rell

7:20 οχος P^{66*} : οχλος P^{66c} ς rell (K Π pc οι ιουδαιοι)

7:22 πατερων P^{66*} : τω̄ (= των) πατερων P^{66c} ς rell

7:25 αποκτιναι P^{66*} W Θ : αποκτειναι P^{66c} ς rell : πιασαι 1279 pc

7:26 μηπο P^{66*} : μηποτε P^{66c} ς rell : μητι ℵ D pc

7:28a εκραζεν P^{66*} D 485 pc it vg : εκραξεν P^{66c} ς rell

7:28b εμε P^{66*} syr^{c,s} : καμε P^{66c} ς rell (και εμε ℵ)

7:30 οι δε εζητουν P^{66*} ℵ : εζητουν ουν P^{66c} ς rell : εζητουν 661

7:33 μεψψντα P^{66*vid} : πεμψαντα P^{66c} ς rell

7:34 ζη·τησεται P^{66*vid} W Θ : ζη·τησετε P^{66c} ς rell : ζητειτε Π* 69 998 : ζητησατε P^{75}

7:37a της μεγαλης εορτης P^{66*} : τη μεγαλη της εορτης P^{66c} ς rell (W pc om τη μεγαλη, D 1093 transpon τη μεγαλη)

John

7:37b εκραζεν P^{66*} ℵ D Θ f^1 al : εκραξεν P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell : εκεκραγε 1093

7:37c προς με om P^{66*} $\aleph^*$ D $it^{b,d,e}$: προς με $P^{66c(in\ mg\ inf)}$ ς rell (P^{75} B εμε)

7:39 $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ (= πνευμα) αγιον P^{66*} ς rell : $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ (= πνευμα) P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ K N^* T Θ Π Ψ pc : πνευμα αγιον δεδομενον B 254 (δοθεν) 1230 2768 : το πνευμα αγιον επ αυτοις D^* (το αγιον επ αυτους D^2)

7:40a πολλοι εκ του οχλου οι P^{66*} : εκ του οχλου ουν P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ B D L T (ου pro ουν) W X f^1 565 pc : πολλοι (οι Θ 124) ουν (118 pon post οχλου) εκ του οχλου (124 add πολλοι) ς rell (2768 των οχλων, 047 pon ακουσαντες ante εκ)

7:40b αυτου των λογων P^{66*} $\aleph^*$ D Θ pc $it^{aur,c,d,ff^2,l}$ vg $syr^{c,p,h}$: των λογων P^{66c} P^{75} $\aleph^c$ B D K L T pm : των λογων αυτου K W Π pc : τον λογον ς rell (124 praem αυτου, f^{13} pc add αυτου) : om plane 106

7:41 αλλοι γον P^{66*vid} : αλλοι ελεγον sec P^{66c1} rell (D^* ελεγαν) : οι δε ελεγον P^{66c2} P^{75} B L N T W X Θ f^1 33 565 1241 al : αλλοι δε ελεγον ς 71^* 485 543

7:42 ην om P^{66*} : ην P^{66c} ς rell

John

7:44a επεβαλ/λεν P^{66*} 131 1424 it^{e} : επεβα/λεν P^{66c} ς rell : εβαλεν P^{75} B L T pc

7:44b επ αυτω P^{66*} U : επ αυτον P^{66c} ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell : αυτω ℵ*

7:46a ουτως $\overline{ανος}$ (= ανθρωπος) ελαλησεν P^{66*} ℵ* D : ελαλησεν ουτως $\overline{ανος}$ (= ανθρωπος) P^{66c} P^{75} $ℵ^{c}$ B L N T W X Ψ 33 1071 1241 pc : ουτως ελαλησεν ανθρωπος ς rell (28 700 pc om ουτως, 1010 pc om ανθρωπος)

7:46b ως ουτος λαλει ο ανθρωπος P^{66*} ℵ* 495 : om plane P^{66c} P^{75} $ℵ^{c}$ B L T W pc : ως ουτος ο ανθρωπος ς rell (3 9 add λαλει) : ως ουτος λαλει D

7:52 εκ της γαλιλαιας ο προφητης P^{66*} : προφητης εκ της γαλιλαιας P^{66c} ς rell (G om της) : εκ της γαλιλαιας προφητης P^{75vid} B L N T X Ψ 892 1424 al

8:12 κοτια P^{66*} : σκοτια P^{66c} ς rell

8:14 καν γε P^{66*} : καν εγω P^{66c} ς rell (καγω Θ, και ει εγω 983, εαν εγω 1241, καγω εαν 1093)

8:17 αλληθης P^{66*} : αληθης P^{66c} ς rell

8:21 αυτοις P^{66*} P^{39vid} P^{75} ℵ B D L T W X pc $it^{b,d,e}$ $cop^{bo^{ms},ach^{2}}$: αυτοις ο $\overline{ις}$ (= ιησους) P^{66c} ς rell : ο ιησους αυτοις 1279 : ο ιησους 28 1071 1241

John

8:25a ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) P^{66*} P^{75} B 476* : ο ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) P^{66c} ς rell : om plane 0250 pc

8:25b την P^{66*} ς rell (047 om την αρχην) : ειπον υ̣μιν την P^{66c}

8:28a αυτοις om P^{66*} B L T W f^{1} 565 892 1241 pc it^{a} : αυτοις P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

8:28b .υψωσηται P$^{66*(?)}$: υψωσηται P$^{66c(\text{man }1)}$ ς rell

8:28c εδειξεν μοι P^{66*} : εδειδαξεν με P^{66c} ς rell : ενετειλατο μοι 1241 : ειρηκεν μοι 0141

8:33 ουδενι δεδουλευκαμεν ουδενι P^{66*} : ουδενι δεδουλευκαμεν P^{66c} ς rell : ου δεδουλευκαμεν ουδενι D

8:34 αυτω P^{66*} : αυτοις P$^{66c(\text{man }1)}$ ς rell : om P^{75} 0141 it^{b,e}

8:36 οτως P^{66*} : οντως P^{66c} ς rell

8:37 τιτε P^{66*} : ζητιτε P^{66c} ς rell

8:38 ε/ρακα P^{66*} : ε/ωρακα P^{66c} ς ℵ B C D S T U X Γ Δ Λ pm : εορακα P^{75} E F G H K L M Θ rell

8:40 λελαληκεν P^{66*} : λελαληκα P^{66c} ς rell : λαλει εν 1689

8:42a ου P^{66*} : ο (ante θεος) P$^{66c(\text{man }1)}$ ς rell : om 660

8:42b εμ(αυτου scripturus erat) P$^{66*\text{vid}}$: εληλυθα p$^{66c(\text{man }1)}$ ς rell (-θον D*, ελαλησα 13)

John

8:44 δευδος P^{66*} : ψευδος P^{66c} ς rell

8:46 πιστευετε P^{66*} : πιστευετε μοι P^{66c} ς
rell : πιστευετε με H

8:48 ελεγομεν P^{66*} 71 249 251 pc : λεγομεν P^{66c}
ς rell (L M X Γ Θ Λ al -ωμεν)

8:49a δαιμονι P^{66*} : δαιμονιον P^{66c} ς rell

8:49b ουχ P^{66*} : ουκ P^{66c} ς rell

8:50 κρινων P^{66*} : κ/ (= και) κρινων P^{66c} ς rell

8:51 λε P^{66*} : λεγω P^{66c} ς rell

8:53a πτρος P^{66*} : πατρος P^{66c} ς rell (D W om
πατρος ημων)

8:53b οτι P^{66*} D it^{a,d} : οστις P^{66c} ς rell

8:54a δοξαζω P^{66*vid} (vel δοξαξω) ς ℵ^{ca} C^{2} rell :
δοξασω P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ* et cb B C* D W Θ f^{1} f^{13} 579 pc

8:54b υμων P^{66*} ς ℵ B* D F X Ψ 700 1010 1071 1424 al :
ημων P^{66c} P^{75} B^{2} rell

8:55 ου γεγνωκατε P^{66*vid} : ουκ εγνωκατε P^{66c} ς rell

8:56 αβραμ P^{66*} : αβρααμ P^{66c} ς rell

9:7 σιωαμ P^{66*} : σιλωαμ P^{66c} ς rell (Θ σιλωα)

9:8 γειτονες αυτου P^{66*} it syr^{s,p} :
γειτονες P^{66c} ς rell

9:10a σου ηνεωχθησαν P^{66*} : ου̅ (= ουν) ηνεωχθησαν
σου P^{66c} ℵ C D L N X Θ Ψ 0124 157 al (vel ανεω-) :
ηνεωχθησαν (vel ανεω-) σου (σοι 124) ς P^{75} rell
(1071 praem δε)

John

9:10b οφαλμοι P^{66*} : οφθαλμοι P^{66c} ς rell

9:15a οι P^{66*} U X 69 124 157 892 1241 2768 al it syr^{s,p} : κ/ (= και) οι P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

9:15b μοι P^{66*} H N 579 713 : μου P^{66c} ς rell : μου (Δ^{*vid} μοι) ante επι et μου post οφθαλμους Δ

9:17 σεαυτου P^{66*} P^{75} ℵ* : αυτου P^{66c} ς rell : εαυτου D

9:18a εως ου P^{66*} D X 544 1071 pc : εως οτου P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell (Δ του) : εως οτε 397 : εως 1321

9:18b του αναβλεψαντος om P^{66*} f^{1} 22 565 al it syr^{s} cop^{bo} : του αναβλεψαντος P$^{66c\text{(in mg sup)}}$ ς rell

9:19 αυτον P^{66*vid} : αυτους P$^{66c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell

9:22 γα P^{66*} : γαρ P^{66c} ς rell

9:24 ε.κτερου P$^{66*(?)}$: εκ δευτερου P^{66c} ς rell

9:25 ουδα P^{66*} : ουκ οιδα P^{66c} ς rell

9:26 οφθαλμου P^{66*} : οφθαλμους P^{66c} ς rell

9:27 αυτοι.ς P$^{66*(?)}$: αυτοις P$^{66c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell (D ο δε ειπεν pro απεκριθη αυτοις)

9:28 μωεως P^{66*} : μωυσεως P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ D S W X Δ Θ 33 al : μωσεως ς rell

9:30 και ειπεν ο $\overline{\text{ανος}}$ (= ανθρωπος) P^{66*} : ο $\overline{\text{ανος}}$ (= ανθρωπος) και ειπεν αυτοις P^{66c} ς P^{75c} (P^{75*} add δ ante ο) rell (D 330 pc om αυτοις)

9:34 ο λογος P^{66*} : ολος P^{66c} ς rell : ολως E* f^1 al

9:36 εφη (post εστιν) P^{66*} P^{75} B W (0124 εφη ante τις) : om P^{66c} ς rell

9:39a τουτον om P^{66*} 1071 1241 1293 Did : τουτō (= τουτον) P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

9:39b πωσιν P^{66*} : βλεπωσιν P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell : βλεψωσιν U Γ 1424 pc

9:39c οι μη βλεποντες (ante τυφλοι) P^{66*} : οι βλεποντες P^{66c} ς rell

9:41 η ααμαμ(αρτια scripturus erat) P^{66*} : η αμαρτια $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ℵ* et cb B K Θ Ψ 1 69 157 489 565 al (P^{75} 138 1093 praem και) : η ουν αμαρτια ς rell : αι αμαρτιαι $ℵ^{ca}$ D L W X 33 al (1241 praem και)

10:4 εκβαλη παντα P^{66*} : παντα εκβαλη P^{66c} P^{75} $ℵ^{ca}$ B D L W X Θ Ψ 1 22 33 565 1241 al : εκβαλη ℵ* et cb : προβατα εκβαλη ς rell

10:6a εγνω̄ (= εγνων) P^{66*} : εγνωσαν P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell : εγινωσκον Θ f^{13} 1170

10:6b τι P^{66*} pc it vg : τινα ην α P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell (P^6 τι pro τινα, E F G 69 η pro ην, L om α, 1170 om ην α)

John

10:7 ειπεν P^{66*} it^{e} : ειπεν ουν P^{66c} ς rell

10:10a κλεπης P^{66*} : κλεπτης P^{66c} ς rell

10:10b κεψη P^{66*} : κλεψη P^{66c} ς rell

10:10c εχωσιν P^{66*} D pc it$^{d,ff^{2}}$: εχωσιν κ/ (= και) $\overline{\text{περισσο}}$ (= περισσον) εχωσιν P^{66c} ς rell (περισσοτερον P^{75} X Γ Ψ 69 1010 2768 pc)

10:12 λυδον P^{66*} : λυκον P^{66c} ς rell

10:16 αυτης P^{66*vid} : αυλης P^{66c} ς rell

10:20 ατου P^{66*} : αυτου P^{66c} ς rell

10:21 .υναται P$^{66*(?)}$: δυναται P^{66c} ς rell

10:22 δε P^{66*} ς rell : τοτε P^{66c} P^{75} B L W Ψ 33 1071 : δε τοτε 1321 : om f^{1} 565 1010 1344 pc

10:26 καθως ειπον υμειν οτι P^{66*} (ς M^{2} Π^{2} [sed rursus rasum] rell καθως [add δε 317] ειπον υμιν) : om P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ B K L M* W Θ Π* 33 1241 pc

10:28 $\overline{\text{ζωη}}$ (= ζωην) αιωνιον διδωμι αυτοις P^{66*} ς M^{2} rell : διδωμι αυτοις $\overline{\text{ζωη}}$ (= ζωην) αιωνιον P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ B L M* W X 33 157 1010 1241 pc

10:29 μοι om P^{66*} : μοι P^{66c} ς rell (εμοι 1242)

10:33 τον $\overline{\text{θν}}$ (= θεον) P^{66*} : $\overline{\text{θν}}$ (= θεον) P^{66c} ς rell

10:34 εκ P^{66*} : εν P^{66c} ς rell

10:36 $\overline{\text{υς}}$ (= υιος) $\overline{\text{θυ}}$ (= θεου) P^{66*} P^{45vid} ℵ D E G W 28 69 1424 al Epiph (472 pc pon θεου ante ειμι) : $\overline{\text{υς}}$ (= υιος) του $\overline{\text{θυ}}$ (= θεου) P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

John

10:37a ουν P^{66*} : ου P^{66c} ς rell : μη f^{13} 1170 : ου μη 1689 : μουη θ

10:37b μ(οι scripturus erat) P^{66*} : πιστευεται μοι $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

10:38a πιστευσηται P^{66*} 1200 1354 : πιστευηται P^{66c} ς P^{45} P^{75} rell (M -ειτε) : πιστευετε pri ℵ A E G H S U W X Δ Θ Λ f^{13} 1 28 33 565 1010 1241 1424 pm : θελετε πιστευειν D it vg

10:38b εν εμ(οι scripturus erat) P^{66*} : εν τω π̄ρ̄ῑ (= πατρι) $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ P^{75} ℵ B D L W X 33 157 1241 2768 pc : εν αυτω ς P^{45} rell

10:41 ειν P^{66*} : ην P^{66c} ς rell : om Θ

11:1a και μαριας (sec) P^{66*} : και μαρθας P^{66c} ς P^{75} D^2 (D^* add της post και) : om A^{*vid} 157

11:1b αυτου P^{66*} A 1^{32} : αυτης P^{66c} ς rell

11:2 και αδελφος η̄ (= ην) λαζαρος ασθενων P^{66*} : ο αδελφος λαζαρος ησθενει P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell (D add και ante ο, P^{45} λαζαρ, 983 1689 om λαζαρος)

11:3 απεστιλεν ουν μαρια προς αυτον λεγουσα P^{66*} : απεστιλαν ουν αι αδελφαι προς αυτον λεγουσαι P^{66c} ς rell (D S f^1 f^{13} 579 1241 al add αυτου post αδελφαι, ℵ 472 pc pon αι αδελφαι post αυτόν, D τον ιησουν pro αυτον, 71 pc om προς αυτον)

John

11:5 αυτης om P^{66*} : [α]υτης $P^{66c(\text{in mg inf})}$ ς rell

11:6 εμεινεν P^{66*} Λ 472 it^{e} : εμεινεν εν P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell (D εμεινεν ο ιησους επι pro εμεινεν εν, P^{45} επι pro εν, 998 εκει pro εν - τοπω)

11:7 αυτοις P^{66*} arm : τοις μαθηταις P^{66c} ς P^{6vid} P^{75} ℵ B L W X Θ Ψ 0250 f^{1} pm : τοις μαθηταις αυτου A D K Γ Δ Λ Π f^{13} 28 1010 al : om P^{45} $it^{e,l}$

11:13 $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ (= ιησους) περι της κοιμησεως P^{66*} : $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ (= ιησους) περι του θανατου P^{66c} ς rell (P^{75} om του)

11:17 ευρον P^{66*} : ευρεν P^{66c} ς rell

11:21 $\overline{\kappa\nu}$ (= κυριον) P^{66*} : $\overline{\iota\nu}$ (= ιησουν) P^{66c} ς rell

11:29 εκεινη P^{66*} (εκεινη. ?) ς C^{2} rell : εκεινη δε P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ B C* L W X Θ f^{13} 33 1241 2768 pc

11:32 μαρια P^{66*} ς P^{45} C^{3} E^{2} rell : μαριαμ P^{66c} P^{75} B C* E* L 33 pc

11:33 εβρειμησατο et και εταραξεν εαυτον P^{66*} P^{75vid} ℵ* A 1010 : εταραχθη et ως εμβριμωμενος P^{66c} P^{45} (-]ọυμẹνο[ς) D (ενβρειμουμενος) Θ 1 pc : ενεβριμησατο et και εταραξεν εαυτον ς $\aleph^{a}$ rell (1093 ενεμβρ-, L* Δ 579 pc αυτον)

11:34a κυριε om P^{66*} : $\overline{\kappa\varepsilon}$ (= κυριε) P^{66c} ς rell

John

11:34b ερχου P^{66*} : ερχου κ/ (= και) P^{66c} ς rell : ελθε και Θ

11:35 ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) P^{66*} $ℵ^{*}$: ο ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) P^{66c} ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell

11:39 τετελευκοτος P^{66*} : τετελευτηκοτος P^{66c} ℵ A B C* D K L W Π Ψ 1241 pc : τεθνηκοτος ς C^2 rell (X 213 τεθνεοτος)

11:40 λεγι P^{66*} : λεγει P^{66c} ς rell

11:41a το/φθαλμους P^{66*vid} : τους ο/φθαλμους P^{66c} ς rell

11:41b οφθαλμους P^{66*} ς P^{75} rell : οφθαλμους αυτου P^{66c} D K 28 33 69 892^{supp} 1241 1424 al it^{aur,b,d,ff^2,r^1} $syr^{s,p,h}$ eth

11:45a προς om P^{66*} : προς P^{66c} ς rell (Δ μετα)

11:45b ο εποιησεν P^{66*vid} A^2 B C D 1 1010 pc $it^{d,e}$ (vel P^{66*} α εποιησεν cum ς P^6 P^{45} A* rell) : οσα εποιησεν P^{66c} 0141 pc

11:48 το τοπον P^{66*} : τον τοπον P^{66c} ς rell : την πολιν W 2145 pc

11:50 εις P^{66*} : ινα εις P^{66c} ς rell

11:51 αλλ P^{66*} I^{vid} S U Γ Θ Ψ 047 f^1 33 565 1241 al : αλλα P^{66c} ς rell (W αρχων pro αρχιερευς)

11:54a λεγουμενην P^{66*vid} : λεγομενην P^{66c} ς rell

John

11:54b πολιν om P^{66*} syr^{s} : πολιν P^{66c} ς rell

11:54c εμινεν P^{66*} P^{75} ℵ B L W 1241 pc : διετριβεν P^{66c} ς P^{45} rell

12:1 πε̄/τε (= πεντε) P^{66*} : εξ P^{66c} ς rell

12:2a ουν om P^{66*} 13 122 vg^{ms} cop^{bo} : ουν P^{66c} ς rell : και ante εποιησαν D 565

12:2b εις P^{66*} : εις ην P^{66c} ς rell : εις ων 1093*

12:3a μυρου πιστικης P^{66*} 1194 it$^{b,c,ff^2}$: μυρου ναρδου πιστικης P^{66c} ς rell it^{aur,f} vg : πιστικης μυρου D it^{d,e}

12:3b επληρουτο P^{66*vid} : επληρωθη P^{66c} ς rell : επλησθη B

12:5 ουτο P^{66*} : τουτο P^{66c} ς rell

12:8 πτω P^{66*} : πτωχους γαρ P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell (L θ arm om γαρ)

12:9a οχλος πολυς P^{66*} ς P^{75} B^{3} 1646* rell (D οχλος δε πολυς et aliter) : ο οχλος ο πολυς P^{66c} W 0250 1010 : ο οχλος πολυς ℵ B* L 28 892^{supp} 1241 1646^{c} pc : οχλος f^{13} 579

12:9b λαον P^{66*} : λαζαρον P^{66c} ς rell

12:12 ο οχλος πολυς P^{66*} B L f^{13} 892^{supp} al : ο οχλος ο πολυς P^{66c} θ (πολ·λυς) : οχλος πολυς ς rell : οχλος 33 2768

12:13 βαλια P^{66*} : βαια P^{66c} ς rell

12:15 πωλου P^{66*} f^{13pt} 579 : πωλον P^{66c} ς rell

12:16a ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) P^{66*} P^{75} rell : ο ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) P^{66c} ς D H W Θ Λ f^{13} 33 579 1241 al

12:16b τοτε om P^{66*} W it syr^{s,p} : τοτε P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

12:16c η P^{66*} : ην P^{66c} ς rell

12:16d εν αυτω P^{66*} : επ αυτω P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell : περι αυτου D Θ 1241

12:18 και om P^{66*} B* (add και post αυτω) E H Δ Λ 472 al it : ϗ (= και) P^{66c} ς P^{75vid} B^{2} (και post αυτω nec a correctoribus deletum) rell

12:19 αυτους P^{66*} D 579 1010 1241 pc it^{a,c,d,e} : εαυτους P^{66c} ς rell

12:22 και παλιν ο ανδρεας δε και ο φιλιππος P^{66*} it$^{b,ff^2}$: ανδρεας δε και φιλιππος P^{66c} it^{c,l} : ανδρεας τε και φιλιππος Θ^{c} (Θ* -ιπος) : και (om D 1321) παλιν (add ο D 1321, add και H) ανδρεας (add τε 1170) και (add ο W) φιλιππος (add και X 1071 2768) ς rell : ερχεται ανδρεας και φιλιππος και P^{75vid} A B L pc it^{a} (ℵ 157 praem και παλιν, 54 1241 praem και, 249 praem παλιν)

12:23 εληλθ(εν scripturus erat) P^{66*vid} : εληλυθεν P$^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

John

12:26a εμοι τις διακονη (pri) εμοι τις διακονη P^{66*} :
εμοι τις διακονη (pri) P^{66c} P^{75} ℵ A B K L
(μοι) M U W X Π Ψ 0250 579 (διακονηση) 892
1241 1424 al : εμοι διακονη τις (pri) ς rell :
τις εμοι διακονη D (μοι) Θ (διδιακονη) f^1 f^{13}
33 565 2768 al

12:26b εστιν P^{66*} pc : εστε P^{66c} ς rell :
εστω 245 579 pc : om L

12:26c εαν (sec) P^{66*} P^{75} ℵ B D L W X Θ Ψ f^1 f^{13} 33
565 892 1241 al : εαν δε P^{66c} 579 it^{b,c,l,r^1} :
και εαν ς rell

12:26d ο $\overline{\text{πηρ}}$ (= πατηρ) P^{66*} ς P^{75} rell : ο $\overline{\text{πηρ}}$
(= πατηρ) μου P^{66c} U Θ f^{13} 28 700^c pc
it^{a,aur,c,e,ff^2,r^1} vg $cop^{sa,bo}$ arm eth

12:29 γεγοναιναι P^{66*vid} : γεγονεναι P^{66c} ς rell
(οτι [om Θ] βροντη γεγονεν D Θ)

12:31 τουτου pri om P^{66*} D W pc it^{b,d,ff^2,l,r^1} vg
syr^s : τουτου pri P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

12:33 αποθνησ.ειν $P^{66*(?)}$: αποθνησκειν P^{66c} ς rell

12:35 ουτοις P^{66*} : αυτοις P^{66c} ς rell

12:36 ιοι P^{66*} : υιοι P^{66c} ς rell

12:37 ταυτα P^{66*} : τοσαυτα P^{66c} ς rell : τοιαυτα F

12:39 ουκυ P^{66*} : ουκ $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

John

12:40 μη νοησωσι P^{66*} D (-σουσιν) it^{a,d,e,f,l} vg^{cl} : νοησωσι P^{66c} ς rell (ℵ K Π al συνωσιν, mss pc συνιωσιν, 69 νοησουσιν)

12:43 ηπερ P^{66*} ς P^{75} rell : υπερ P^{66c} ℵ L W X f^{1} 33 69 157 565 579 al : ειπερ Λ Ψ pc : η 1241 pc

12:44 εκραζεν P^{66*} A* D Θ f^{13} it$^{b,c,d,ff^{2},l,q,r^{1}}$: εκραξεν P^{66c} ς P^{75} A$^{*vid\ corr}$ rell : εκεκραζεν 472

12:45 και τον P^{66*} it^{e} : τον P^{66c} ς rell

12:46 πας om P^{66*} B 047 syr^{s} : πας P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell

12:47 μη P^{66*} ς P^{75} rell (μη ante ακουση W [et μηδε ante φυλαξη] 579) : om P^{66c} D S Θ 0124 1241 pc it

12:48 εκρινοντα P^{66*} : εχει τον κρινοντα P^{66c} ς rell (E Δ 251 κριναντα)

13:1 προν P^{66*} : προς τον P^{66c} ς rell

13:7 αρ P^{66*} : γαρ P^{66c1} : αρτι P^{66c2} ς rell : τι W

13:9 χει P^{66*} : χειρας P^{66c} ς rell

13:10a λειλουμενος P^{66*} : λελουμενος P^{66c} ς rell (E f^{13pt} 2 λελουσμενος)

13:10b ποδδας P^{66*} : ποδας P^{66c} ς rell

John

13:10c ολος $P^{66*(?)}$ ς rell : ολως $P^{66c1(?)}$:
ολος[[ος]] P^{66c2} ς rell

13:14 οφιειλεται P^{66*} : οφειλεται P^{66c} ς rell

13:15 γαρ om P^{66*} 472 700 it^{d} : γαρ P^{66c} ς rell

13:16 μειζων sec om P^{66*} : μιζον P^{66c} W (μειζον) :
μειζων sec ς rell

13:18 εμε P^{66*} B : επ εμε P^{66c} ς rell

13:19a απ αρτι λεγω θμιν προ om P^{66*} : απ αρτι λεγω
υμιν προ $P^{66c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell (1241 om υμιν, 71
om προ του γενεσθαι)

13:19b οετι P^{66*} (vel οστις scripturus erat) :
οτι $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

13:20a αν P^{66*} ℵ (A α) B C K L M W X Π Ψ 068 33 1241
al : εαν P^{66c} ς rell

13:20b και τον P^{66*} : τον P^{66c} ς rell

13:20c με (πεμψαντα scripturus erat) P^{66*} :
πεμψαντα με $P^{66c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell :
αποστειλαντα με X f^{1pt} 892 pc

13:21a $\overline{\text{ις}}$ (= ιησους) P^{66*} ℵ B L 87 (post πνευματι
pon) : ο $\overline{\text{ις}}$ (= ιησους) P^{66c} ς rell

13:21b τω $\overline{\text{πνα}}$ (= πνευμα) P^{66*} : τω $\overline{\text{πνι}}$ (= πνευματι)
P^{66c} ς rell : om f^{13pt}

13:21c λεγων P^{66*vid} : λεγω P^{66c} ς rell

John

13:23a κοπω P^{66*} : κολπω P^{66c} ς rell

13:23b $\overline{\text{ις}}$ (= ιησους) P^{66*} B : ο $\overline{\text{ις}}$ (= ιησους) P^{66c} ς rell : om 69 213 it$^{e,r^1}$

13:24a ϗ (= και) λεγει αυτω ειπε $P^{66*(?)}$ it^{c} eth : πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη P^{66c} ς rell (f^{13} 1241 πειθεσθαι, 579 αυτω τι pro τις, Θ η pro ειη, D add ουτος post ειη) : πυθεσθαι Ψ : και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν B C L X 068 33 892 1071 pc : πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου ελεγεν και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν ℵ

13:24b λεγει sec P^{66*} ς rell : ειπεν P^{66c} it^{e}

13:25 αναπεσ$\overline{\text{ω}}$ (= αναπεσων) P^{66*} ℵ^{c} B C* K L X Π* Ψ 33 892 pc : επιπεσ$\overline{\text{ω}}$ (= επιπεσων) P^{66c} ℵ* C^{3} Π^{2} rell

13:26 ψας P^{66*} : εμβαψας (sec) P^{66c} ς 1071^{c} rell : βαψας ℵ B C D L X 33 69 892 1071* 1241 pc

13:32 ϗ (= και)/και P^{66*} : /και pri P^{66c} ς rell

13:35 εσται αθηται P^{66*} : εσται μαθηται P^{66c} : μαθηται εστε ς rell

14:2a αν ειπον P^{66*} : ειπον αν P^{66c} ς rell (X suppl αν supra lineam, ℵ W 579 pc om αν, 213 pon αν post υμιν)

14:2b οτι om P^{66*} ς C^{corr} rell : οτι P^{66c} ℵ A B C* D K L W X Π Ψ f^{13} 33 565 892 1071 al

John

14:3	παλιν ερχομαι παλιν ερχομαι P^{66*} : παλιν ερχομαι P^{66c} ς rell (D ερχομαι παλιν, 317 παλιν ελευσομαι)
14:4	και την οδον οιδαται P^{66*} ς C^3 rell : την οδον P^{66c} ℵ B C* L Q W X 33 157 579 1071 pc it^a
14:9	ενωκας P^{66*} : εγνωκας P^{66c} ς rell
14:10a	εμαυτου P^{66*} : εμαυτου ου P^{66c} ς rell
14:10b	εν εν P^{66*vid} : εν εμοι $P^{66c(\text{man } 1)}$ ς rell
14:11	εργα αυτου P^{66*} P^{75} B 229* eth : εργα αυτα P^{66c} ς rell (157 pc om αυτα, 579 ταυτα)
14:12a	αμην αμη P^{66*} : αμην P^{66c1} it^{aur} : αμην αμην P^{66c2} ς rell
14:12b	ειστευων P^{66*} : ο πειστευων P^{66c} ς rell
14:12c	κακει(νος scripturus erat) P^{66*} : και $P^{66c(\text{man } 1)}$ ς rell
14:12d	τουτων om P^{66*} : τουτων P^{66c} ς rell
14:14	εγω P^{66*} ς M^2 rell : τουτο εγω P^{66c} 1241 : εγω τουτο M* : τουτο P^{75} A B L Γ $Λ^2$ Ψ 060 33 al
14:15	αγαπηται P^{66*} : αγαπαται P^{66c} ς rell
14:16	αλλα P^{66*} : αλλον P^{66c} ς rell
14:17a	αυτον (post θεωρει) et αυτον (ante οτι) P^{66*} D* L 579 1010 pc : αυτο et αυτο P^{66c} ς P^{75} rell : αυτο et αυτον G^2 W : αυτον et αυτο $ℵ^{ca}$ (sed restitutum αυτο pri)

John

14:17b γεινωσκει P^{66*} P^{75} ℵ B W 579 it^{a} :
γεινωσκει αυτο P^{66c} ς rell :
γινωσκει αυτον D* L 1010 pc

14:17c εστι̅ (= εστιν) P^{66*} B D* W 1 69 565 pc it :
εσται P^{66c} ς P^{75vid} D^{2} rell it$^{aur,r^1}$ vg

14:22 τι P^{66*} ς P^{75} A B D E L X Θ 33 700 1241 al :
ϗ (= και) τι P^{66c} rell

14:23a παρ (pri) P^{66*} 185 it^{e,q} : προς P^{66c} ς
rell (998 om προς αυτον)

14:23b εισελευσομεθα P^{66*} : ελευσομεθα P^{66c} ς P^{75}
rell (απελ- 1010 pc, πορευ- 69, ελευσομαι D)

14:24 του (pri) P^{66*} : τους P^{66c} ς rell (τον
λογον 1194, τας εντολας 579)

14:26 πεμψει P^{66*} ς rell (L Λ 29* -ψη, 579 πεμψας με
pro πεμψει ο) : πεμψει υμιν P^{66c} syr^{s}

15:3 εν υμειν P^{66*} : υμειν P^{66c} ς rell

15:4 κημα P^{66*} : κλημα P^{66c} ς rell

15:6 εμη P^{66*} : εαν μη P^{66c} ς rell (Θ* μη τις μη,
Θ^{c} τις μη)

15:7 [μ]ενει P^{66*} L 69 (μενη 3 157) : [μ]εινη P^{66c}
ς rell

15:10a εαν τας εντολας μου om P^{66*} : εαν τα̤ς εντολας
μο[υ] P^{66c} ς rell (A τας εμας pro μου)

John

15:10b τηρηται P^{66*} : τηρησηται P^{66c} ς rell : τηρησετε ℵ^{c} L

15:10c αγαπη (pri) P^{66*} it^{e} : αγαπη μου P^{66c} ς rell : αγαπη τη εμη ℵ^{c} X 1187

15:10d μενω μ(ου scripturus erat) P^{66*} : μενω αυτου P$^{66c(man 1)}$ ς rell (346 om αυτου)

15:15 προς P^{66*} (vel προ) : παρα P^{66c} ς rell

15:16a εθηκα ιν̣α̣ υμα̣[ς] P^{66*} : εθηκα υμα̣[ς] ιν̣α̣ P^{66c} ς rell (Δ 565 1424 pc om και εθηκα υμας)

15:16b κα P^{66*} : και P^{66c} ς rell

15:16c ο φε̣ρηται P^{66*} : φε̣ρηται P^{66c} ς rell

15:17 ινα om P^{66*} D it^{d,e} Non : ιν̣[α] P^{66c} ς rell

15:18 εμισησε P^{66*} : εμισει P^{66c} : μισει ς rell

15:19 τουτου κοσμου P^{66*} it : κοσμου sec P^{66c} ς rell

15:22 [α]μ̣αρτιας̣ P^{66*} it$^{c,e,ff^{2},l,q}$ Ambr : [α]μ̣αρτιας̣ [αυ]τ̣ω̣ν̣ P^{66c} ς rell

15:25 [ν]ο̣μω P^{66*} : [ν]ο̣μω αυ[των] P^{66c} ς rell

16:7 εαν δε πορευθω πεμψω αυτον προς υμας om P^{66*}(in lacuna) : εαν δε πορευθω πεμψω̣ [αυτον προς] υμας P^{66c}(in mg sup) ς rell (και εαν pro εαν δε 1689, om δε 69 1355, add εγω ante (168 [826 1689 post] πορευθω f^{13pt})

16:19 η̣μελλον κα̣[ι η]θελον P^{66*} : η̣μελλον P^{66c} ℵ W 69 579 it$^{c,ff^{2}}$: ηθελον ς rell

John

16:25 λαλησω υμειν απαγγελω [υ]μ̣ειν P^{66*} :
απαγγελω [υ]μ̣ειν P^{66c}(man 1) ℵ (-λλ-) A B C*
D K L M U W X Y Θ Π 054 28 33 al : αναγγελω
υμιν ς C^{corr} rell (1241 -λλ-)

16:32 [σκορπ]ι̣σ̣[θ]η̣ται π[...].. P^{66*} (παντες ?) :
[σκορπ]ι̣σ̣[θ]η̣ται P^{66c} ς rell (σκορπισθη 209)

17:5 ε̣ιχον πα[ρ]α̣ σ̣οι et ειναι P^{66*} D $it^{a,d,f}$ syr^{p} :
ε̣ιχον πα[ρ]α̣ σ̣οι et ειναι πα[ρα σοι] P^{66c} :
ειχον et ειναι παρα σοι ς rell

17:6 τερ̣[ηκαν] P^{66*vid} : τετ̣[η]ρ̣[ηκαν] $P^{66c vid}$
B D L W 0109 : ετηρησαν ℵ N 33 :
τετηρηκασι ς rell

17:8 οτι τα ρηματα α εδωκας μοι δεδωκα αυτοις και
om P^{66*vid}(in lacuna) : [οτι τα ρηματα α
εδωκας μοι δεδω]κα αυτοις κ[αι] P^{66c}(in mg sup)
ς rell (vel similia verba)

17:10 εδ̣ο̣ξ̣α̣σ̣με P^{66*} : δεδ̣ο̣ξ̣α̣σ̣με P^{66c} ς rell :
εδοξασας με D

17:11a ο̣[νομ]α̣τι μου P^{66*} : ο̣[νομ]α̣τι σου P^{66c} ς rell

17:11b ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις om P^{66*} it cop^{ach^2} :
[ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις] P^{66c}(vid in mg inf)
ς rell (add και post καθως B Θ 054 69 579 700
1010 al)

17:12a ονομ̣ατι μου P^{66*} : ονομ̣ατι σου P^{66c} ς rell :
ονοματι 565

John

17:12b ω δεδωκας μοι om P^{66*} ℵ* : ω̣ [δεδωκας μοι] P$^{66c vid}$ ℵ^{c} (ο pro ω) B L 33 pc (vel P^{66c} ω̣ [εδωκας μοι] cum C* W 579) : ους δεδωκας μοι ς rell (εδωκας C^{3} N)

17:12c εξ om P^{66*} : εξ̣ P^{66c} ς rell

17:14 καθως εγω εκ του κοσμου ουκ ειμι om P^{66*} D Π* f^{13} pc it syr^{s} : καθως εγω εκ τ̣[ου κοσμου ουκ ειμι] P$^{66c(in\ mg\ sup)}$ M 248 945 1241 pc : καθως εγω (ℵ^{c}, ℵ* om) ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου ς rell

17:16 εκ [το]υ̣ [κ]οσμου ουκ ε̣[ι]σ̣ιν καθως [ε]κ το[υ] κο[σ]μ̣ο̣υ̣ ου[κ ειμι] P^{66*} : om P^{66c} : εκ του κοσμου ουκ εισιν καθως εγω εκ του κοσμου ουκ ειμι ς rell : εκ (add τουτου D) του κοσμου ουκ εισιν καθως εγω (καγω D 69 97) ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου ℵ A B C D L W X al : om versus 15 et 16 33 225 397 cop$^{bo^{mss}}$

17:19 και sec om P^{66*} 544 it^{a,b,c,e} : ϗ (= και) sec P^{66c} ς rell

18:1 [χειμ]α̣ρου P^{66*} : [χειμ]α̣ρρου P^{66c} ς rell

18:2 αυτου om P^{66*} : αυ[του] P^{66c} ς rell

18:5 [ιουδας] P^{66*vid} syr^{s} : [ιουδας ο] παραδ̣ι̣δ̣[ους αυτον] P$^{66c vid}$ ς rell

John

18:12 και sec P^{66*} : και οι P^{66c} ς rell

18:15 ο δε μαθητης εκεινος ην γνωστος τω αρχιερει om P^{66*} : ο δ̣[ε μαθητης εκε]ι̣νο[ς ην γνωσ]τος τω̣ αρχιερε[ι] P$^{66c(in\ mg\ sup)}$ ς rell (γνωστος ην B W 579 pc, add αλλος ante μαθητης 477 565)

18:16 θυρω P^{66*} : θυρουρω P^{66c} : θυρωρω ς rell

18:17 ει om P^{66*} : ε̣ι̣ P^{66c} ς rell

18:34 τουτο P^{66*} P^{60} ℵ* D^{supp} 59 472 : [σ]υ τουτο P^{66c} ℵ^{c} ς rell

18:40a λεγοντες om P^{66*} 251 397 it Chr : λεγοντες P^{66c} ς rell

18:40b β̣[αραββας] P^{66*} D^{supp} : ο β̣[αραββας] P^{66c} ς rell

19:4 [εξ]ηλθεν P^{66*vid} (vel [και εξ]ηλθεν) ℵ D^{supp} Γ f^{1} 157 565 al it vg syr^{h} : [εξ]ηλθεν ουν P^{66c} ς rell : και εξηλθεν A B K L X Π 33 al

19:5 και λεγει αυτοις ιδου ο ανθρωπος om P^{66*} it$^{a,e,ff^2,r^1}$ cop$^{ach^2}$: [και λεγει αυτοις ιδου ο ανθρωπος] P$^{66c(vid\ in\ mg\ inf)}$ ς rell (vel similia verba)

19:6 $\overline{\text{[σ⳨ο]ν}}$ (= σταυρωσον) P^{66*} 054^{c} 1010 pc it$^{a,e,r^1}$: $\overline{\text{[σ⳨ο]ν}}$ $\overline{\text{σ̣⳨̣ον}}$ (= σταυρωσον σταυρωσον) P^{66c} ς rell

19:11 κ̣αι απεκ̣[ριθη] P^{66*} θ : απεκ̣[ριθη] P^{66c} ς rell

19:12 αν P^{66*} B : εαν P^{66c} ς rell

19:13a οῡ (= ουν) P^{66*} : ο οῡ (= ουν) P^{66c} ς rell (579 τοτε ουν ο)

19:13b εις τοπον λεγομενον om P^{66*} : εις τοπ[ον] $P^{66c\text{vid(in mg sup)}}$: εις τοπον λεγομενον ς rell (επιλεγ- 346, 1 565 pc ος λεγεται pro λεγομενον)

19:14 ην ως om P^{66*} : ην̣ ως P^{66c} ℵ A B L W X Δ Π Ψ 33 al : δε ως E I S Y Γ Θ Λ 054 065 pm : δε ωσει ς rell : ην ωσει D^{supp} M N U f^{1} f^{13} 565 1241 al : δε ην ως K pc

19:15a ελεγον P^{66*vid} ℵ* W : [εκ]ραυγασαν P^{66c} ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell (-γασον A 1346*, -γαζον D^{supp} K N Y Θ Π 054 1241 al, -αυασαν L M)

19:15b αρον P^{66*} $ℵ^{ca}$ $it^{c,n}$: αρον αρον P^{66c} ς rell

19:17 και βασταζων εαυτω τον σταυρον εξηλθεν om P^{66*} : και βασταζων εαυτω [τον σταυρον εξη]λ̣θεν $P^{66c\text{(in mg sup)}}$ P^{60} ℵ L W Π Ψ (B X 33 pc αυτω, D^{supp} pc εαυτου, 482 pc αυτου) : και βασταζων τον σταυρον αυτου εξηλθεν ς rell (A N U Θ 1241 al εαυτου, f^{1} 565 εαυτω, 1582 αυτω) : και βασταζων αυτον εξηλθεν f^{13}

19:18 $\overline{\text{σ⳨αν}}$ P^{66*} : $\overline{\text{εσ⳨αν}}$ (= εσταυρωσαν) P^{66c} ς rell

John

19:28 ινα τελειωθη η γραφη om P^{66*} : ινα τελειω̣θη η̣ [γ]ρ̣αφη P^{66c}(in mg inf) ς rell (ℵ D^{supp} Θ f^1 f^{13} pc πληρωθη pro τελειωθη [et 1 565 2768 pc post γραφη pon], 655 ινα η γραφη τελειωθη)

19:38 απ[ο] P^{66*} A B D^{supp} L Ψ 579 pc : ο̣ απ[ο] P^{66c} ς rell

19:39a α̣[υτο] P^{66*} : α̣[υτο]ν̣ P^{66c} A B L U X Y Ψ 054 pc : τον ιησουν ς rell

19:39b πρω̣τ̣[ον] P^{66*} : το πρω̣τ̣[ον] P^{66c} ς rell : προτερον f^{13pt} : το προτερον f^{13pt} 1321 : om 713

19:40 τω P^{66*} : των̣ P^{66c} ς rell : om 69 pc

20:4 [ματης] P^{66*vid} : [μα]θη[της] P^{66cvid} ς rell

20:11 μαρια P^{66*} ς rell : μαριαμ P^{66c} ℵ Ψ 050 f^1 33 565 pc

20:14 κ̅ς̅ (= κυριος) P^{66*} it^b : ι̅ς̅ (= ιησους) P^{66c} ς rell (ς Λ al praem ο)

20:18 αγ̣[γε]λλου̣σα P^{66*} ℵ* A B X 078 0250 pc : απαγ̣[γε]λλου̣σα P^{66c} ς $ℵ^c$ rell : αναγγελλουσα E G S W Δ Ψ 33 1010 al

20:30 βιβλ[ιω] P^{66*} : τω βιβλ[ιω] P^{66c} ς rell : τω βιβλω D

Corrections in P^{72}

Jude

3a παραοθειση P^{72*} : παραδοθειση P^{72c} ς
rell : δοθειση 467

3b πειστι τοις αγιοις P^{72*} 337 460 :
τοις αγιοις πειστει P^{72c} ς rell

4a τουτο P^{72*} : τουτο το P^{72c} ς rell

4b κρικμα P^{72*} : κριμα P^{72c} ς rell : κηρυγμα Ψ

4c τη P^{72*} : την P^{72c} ς rell

4d νομον P^{72*} : om P^{72c} : μονον ς rell

7 εκπορνευσασθαι P^{72*} : εκπορνευσασαι P^{72c} ς rell

10 βασφημουσιν P^{72*} : βλασφημουσιν P^{72c} ς rell

11 αυτοι P^{72*} : αυτοις P^{72c} ς rell

12a αυτους P^{72*} : εαυτους P^{72c} ς rell

12b παραφερομενοι P^{72*} B Ψ 1846 1852 pc :
παραφερομεναι P^{72c} rell : περιφερομεναι ς
255 : διαφερομεναι 1898 : φερομεναι 489
927 1873 : φερομενοι 056

13 κυματα κυματα P^{72*} : κυματα P^{72c} ς rell

15 σκληρω̅ (= σκληρων) P^{72*} : των σκληρω̅
(= σκληρων) P^{72c} ς rell

16 μεμψιμοιροι P^{72*} : μεμψιμοιροι κατα τας
επιθυμιας εαυτω πορεομενοι P^{72c} : μεμψιμοιροι
(-μιροι P) κατα τας επιθυμιας εαυτων (C L P 1
209 547 1175 1241 1739 pm, αυτων ς rell)
πορευομενοι ς rell : μεμψιμοιροι κατα τας
εαυτων επιθυμιας πορευομενοι 38 255

Jude

17a υμει P^{72*} : υμεις P^{72c} ς rell

17b αγαπητοις P^{72*} : αγαπητοι P^{72c} ς rell

18 εαυτω P^{72*} : εαυτων P^{72c} ς rell :
αυτων ℵ* Ψ 630 1611 pc

20 προσεχομενοι P^{72*} : προσευχομενοι P^{72c} ς rell

25 κ̅υ̅ω̅ (= κυριω ?) P^{72*} : κ̅υ̅ (= κυριου) P^{72c}
ς rell

1 Peter

1:7 χρυειου P^{72*} : χρυσειου P^{72c} ς rell :
χρυσου B 945

1:8a ει P^{72*} : εις P^{72c} ς rell

1:8b πειστευετε P^{72*} : πειστευοντες P^{72c} ς rell

1:17a κακλειτε P^{72*} : καλειτε P^{72c} :
επικαλεισθε ς rell : αιτεισθε 322 323

1:17b υμω P^{72*} : υμων P^{72c} ς rell

1:21 υτο̅ (= υτον) P^{72*} : αυτο̅ (= αυτον) P^{72c} ς rell

1:22 ηγνικοτες ηγνικοτες P^{72*} : ηγνικοτες P^{72c} ς
rell

2:7 οιμεν P^{72*} : οιμειν P^{72c} ς ℵ^{c} (et iam ℵ^{a} vel
ℵ*ipse corr) rell : ημιν ℵ*

2:21 αποσειμπανων P^{72*} : απολειμπανων P^{72c} :
υπολιμπανων ς rell : υπολαμβανων P

2:22 σοματι P^{72*} : στοματι P^{72c} ς rell

1 Peter

3:9 ευλοκγουντες P^{72*} : ευλογουντες P^{72c} ς rell

3:18a αδικω P^{72*} : αδικων P^{72c} ς rell

3:18b ινα δικων ινα P^{72*} : ινα P^{72c} ς rell (ιν 69)

4:3 παρεληληυθωνς P^{72*} : παρεληλυθως P^{72c} ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell (ℵ* 33 483 -θος) : παραλελυθως A

4:11a ως P^{72*} : ω P^{72c} ς rell

4:11b ει P^{72*} : εις P^{72c} ς rell

4:12 πειρασζον P^{72*} : πειρασμον P^{72c} ς rell : πειρασμων 255

4:15 ω κλεπτης P^{72*} : ως κλεπτης P^{72c} 69 cop^{bo} : κλεπτης ς rell

5:5a παντεες P^{72*} : παντες P^{72c} ς rell

5:5b αντιαντιτασσεσται P^{72*} : αντιτασσεται P^{72c} ς rell

2 Peter

1:5 κγνωσιν P^{72*} : γνωσιν P^{72c} ς rell

1:8 κ̅υ̅ (= κυριου) P^{72*} : του κ̅υ̅ (= κυριου) $P^{72c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell

1:13 διεκγειρι̅ν̅ P^{72*} : διεγειρι̅ν̅ P^{72c} ς rell

2:4 οκ P^{72*} : ουκ P^{72c} ς rell

2:6 το διγμα P^{72*} : εις το διγμα P^{72c} : υποδειγμα ς rell

2 Peter

2:9 τρειν P^{72*} : τηρειν P^{72c} ς rell

2:18 αποφθευγοντας P^{72*} : αποφευγοντας P^{72c} ℵ A B C Ψ 33 322 323 424** 945 1241 1739 al : αποφυγοντας ς rell

3:3 ελυσονται P^{72*} : ελευσονται P^{72c} ς rell

3:6 κοσκμος P^{72*} : κοσμος P^{72c} ς rell

3:9a βουμενος P^{72*} : βουλομενος $P^{72c(man\ 2)}$ ς rell

3:9b νας P^{72*} : τινας P^{72c} ς rell : τινα P 33 102 1852 pc

3:11 υπαρχειν P^{72*} P^{74} B 1175 vg^{ms} Spec : υπαρχειν υμας P^{72c} ς $ℵ^{c}$ rell : υπαρχειν ημας ℵ* 102 209 630 917 1518 1898 2464 al : υμας υπαρχειν 642 : παρεχειν εαυτους 1243

3:14 αμαμητοι P^{72*} : αμωμητοι P^{72c} ς rell : αμωμοι A 33 614 630 915 1241 1505 2495 al

Corrections in P^{75}

Luke

6:19 εξηρ[....] P^{75*} : εξηρ[.$\overset{ε}{.}$..] P^{75c} :
εξηρχετο ς rell

6:38 [υπε]ρ̣εκχυνομ̣ε̣νο̣[ν] P^{75*} ς B^3 E* H K M V^{vid}
X Γ Δ Θ Ψ 579 892 1241 pm : [υπε]ρ̣εκχυννομ̣ε̣νο̣[ν]
P^{75c} ℵ A B* C D E^2 L P S U W Δ Π 33 700 al :
υπερεκκεχυμενον 047

6:44 συλ̣[λεγουσι]ν συλ[λεγ]ουσιν P^{75*} :
συλ[λεγ]ουσιν P^{75c} ς rell (ℵ Θ συνλ-) :
συναγουσιν 1424 pc : εκλεγονται D

7:22a απ̣[ο]κ̣ρει[θεις] P^{75*} : απ̣[ο]κ̣ρι[θεις] P^{75c}
ς rell

7:22b και χ̣ω[λ]οι P^{75*} W Θ Ψ f^{13} 1241 1424 pc $it^{aur,e}$
syr^h : χ̣ω[λ]οι P^{75c} ς rell

9:21 εγε[ιν] P^{75*} : λεγε[ιν] P^{75c} ℵ A B C D K L M
W Θ Ξ Π f^1 f^{13} 544 700 al : ειπειν ς rell

9:22 τριτη P^{75*} : τη τριτη ημ[ερα] P^{75c}(man 1)
ς rell : μεθ ημερας τρεις D

9:57 αν P^{75*} ς rell : εαν P^{75c} P^{45} A B C K L S
U Ξ Π Ψ f^{13} 33 579 892 1241 al

10:24 ιδαν P^{75*} ℵ C Ξ : ειδαν P^{75c} B L :
ιδον K V X Π* al : ειδον ς rell

Luke

10:28 απεκριθεις P^{75*vid} θ : απεκριθης P^{75c} ς rell : εκρινας L 40 76 218 1675

10:31 κατα συγκυρειαν P^{75*} ς rell (συνκ- P^{45} A W θ) : κατα συγτυχειαν P^{75c} : κατα τυχα D : om it

11:5 αυτη P^{75*vid} : αυτω P^{75c} ς rell

11:7a η θυρα μου P^{75*} : η θυρα P^{75c} ς rell

11:7b παιδα P^{75*vid} : παιδια P^{75c} ς rell

11:18 εκβαλειν P^{75*} F^{vid} X pc : εκβαλλειν P^{75c} ς rell (565 pc -λλω, P^{45} W pc -λλει)

11:31 βασιλισ/σα P^{75*} : βασιλισα/ νοτου $P^{75c(man\ 2)}$: βασιλισσα νοτου ς rell

11:34a φωτινον P^{75*} W θ : φωτεινον P^{75c} ς rell

11:34b πονηρος P^{75*} ς rell : supra πονηρος fere decem litteras scripsit $P^{75c(man\ 3)}$

11:53 ηρξατο P^{75*} : ηρξαντο P^{75c} ς rell

12:4 φοβητε P^{75*} : φοβηθητε P^{75c} ς rell : πτοηθητε P^{45} 700

12:10 ηρει P^{75*vid} : ερει P^{75c} ς rell

12:18 τον σιτον μου P^{75*} $ℵ^{a\ et\ c}$ X f^{13} pc : τον σιτον P^{75c} B L 070 f^{1} 157 579 892 1241 : τα γενηματα μου ς ℵ* rell (vel γεννη-, 1675 om μου) : om plane 1573

Luke

12:28 κλιβανον P^{75*} ς B^3 rell :
κλειβανον P^{75c} P^{45} B^* W

12:33 θησαυ.ον P^{75*}(?) : θησαυρον P^{75c} ς rell

12:39 τουτο P^{75*} : τουτο δε P^{75c} ς rell

12:53 νυμφην P^{75*} $\aleph^*$ Δ^* pc it^1 cop^{bopt} :
νυμφην αυτης P^{75c}(man 1) ς P^{45} $\aleph^c$ Δ^2 rell (N Ψ
070 579 εαυτης)

13:16 υ̣ο̣σαν P^{75*}(?) : σαν P^{75c} : ουσαν ς rell

13:27 λεγω P^{75*} ς rell : λεγων P^{75c} B 892 1424 pc :
om ℵ 225 579 1195

14:15 αστις P^{75*}(?) : οστις P^{75c} $\aleph^a$ B L P R X f^1
f^{13} 579 pc : ος ς rell

14:18 σοι P^{75*} : σαι P^{75c} ς $\aleph^a$ rell : om $\aleph^*$

14:23 δουλον αυτου P^{75*} D 72 983 $it^{a,b,d}$ $syr^{s,c,p}$:
δουλον P^{75c} ς P^{45} rell

14:28 ψηφι.ει P^{75*}(?) : ψηφιζει P^{75c} ς P^{45} rell :
ψηφισει Θ

15:12 επιβαλον P^{75*} : επιβαλλον P^{75c} ς rell (N
επιβαλλος pro επιβαλλον μερος)

15:24 απολολως P^{75*} : απολωλως P^{75c} ς rell (G K M
R S X Γ Θ Π^* 1241 pm απολωλος)

16:21 του .... P^{75*}(?) : του πλουσιου P^{75c}(man 1)
ς rell

Luke

16:29	αβραμ P^{75*} : αβρααμ P^{75c} ς rell
17:1	εστιν P^{75*} ς^{e} 1574 (pc ?) : εστιν του P^{75c} ς rell
17:11	γαλιλ̣α̣ι̣[ας] P^{75*} ς B^{3} rell : γαλειλ̣α̣ι̣[ας] P^{75c} B*
17:14a	αυτοις P^{75*} ς rell : αυτοις θελω καθαρισθητε κ/ (= και) ευθεως εκαθαρισθησαν P^{75c}(man 2 [in mg inf]) : αυτοις τεθεραπευεσθε D (D^{2} -πευσθε)
17:14b	επορευθεντες P^{75*} : πορευθεντες P^{75c} ς rell : υπαγετε 157
17:22	μιων P^{75*} : μιαν P^{75c} ς rell
17:27	π(αμουν) scripturus erat) P^{75*} : εγαμουν P^{75c}(man 1) ς rell
18:9	ε̣ξουθενουντε̣ς P^{75*} B 71 115 259 543 1047 1071 1207 : ε̣ξουδενουντε̣ς P^{75c} [[0139]] : εξουθενουντας ς rell : εξουδενουντας N 1223 : εξουθενουνται 2145 : εξουθενουσιν 1093
18:11	και P^{75*} : και ω[ς] P^{75c} ς rell
22:11	καταλυμμα P^{75*} : καταλυμα P^{75c} ς rell
22:26	νεω̣τερ̣[ος] P^{75*} 13 69 1279 : ο νεω̣τερ̣[ος] P^{75c} ς rell (1241 νεοτερος) : μεικροτερος D
22:64	τι P^{75*} : τις P^{75c} ς rell (της θ)
23:2	αυτον P^{75*} 983 : αυτου P^{75c} ς rell

Luke

23:6 ε̣π̣ηρωτησ̣[ε]ν P^{75*vid} ς rell :

ηρωτησ̣[ε]ν P^{75c}

23:21 λεγον P^{75*} : λεγοντ̣ε̣ς̣ P^{75cvid} ς rell

(D εκραξαν pro επεφωνουν λεγοντες)

23:22 αυτω P^{75*} : εν αυτω P^{75c} ς rell (εν αυτων Θ)

23:26 απηαγον P^{75*} : απηγαγον P^{75c} ς rell :

απηγον B 472 475 : επηγαγον 1604

23:28 θυγατερε P^{75*} : θυγατερες P^{75c} ς rell

23:35 ουτως P^{75*} : ουτος P^{75c} ς rell :

αυτος 1675 : υιος B

23:45 εκλιποντος P^{75*} ℵ C^{*vid} L 0124 pc (syr^{hmg}):

εκλειποντος P^{75c} B (pc ?) : aliter ς C^{3} rell

23:47 εδοξαζεν P^{75*} ℵ B D L R Ψ 0124 892 1241 pc :

εδοξασεν P^{75c} ς rell

23:49 ιστηκεισαν P^{75*} A H P Q R W Δ Θ al :

ειστηκεισαν P^{75c} ς ℵ B C D al

24:15 ομιλειν P^{75*} ς B^{3} rell : ομειλειν P^{75c} B* Θ

24:18 τη ημερα ταυτη P^{75*} : τη ημεραις ταυταις

P$^{75c(man\ 1)}$: ταις ημεραις ταυταις ς rell

24:26 βασιλειαν P^{75*} : δοξαν P$^{75c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell

John

1:4 ζωην P^{75*} : ζωη ην pri P^{75c} ς rell
(εστιν pro ην ℵ D, om ην W^{supp})

1:10 ην P^{75*} ς rell : ηηεν P^{75c}

1:18 πωποτε εορακεν P^{75*} : εορακεν πωποτε P^{75c}
ς P^{66} B* rell(ς ℵ A B^{3} C L Γ Δ Θ pm εωρακεν)

1:26 ιωανης P^{75*} B : ιωαννης P^{75c} ς P^{66} rell

1:34 καγω P^{75*} ς rell : και ε̣γω $P^{75c\,vid}$:
και πυρι καγω C* cop^{sa} Or

1:40 πετρος P^{75*} : πετρου P^{75c} ς rell

1:44 βηδσαιδα P^{75*} Θ $it^{a,b,ff^{2}}$ cop^{bo} : βηθσαιδα
P^{75c} ς $\aleph^{c}$ rell : βηθσαιδαν P^{66} ℵ* 8 127 1093

2:4 σοι P^{75*} ς rell : συ $P^{75c\,vid}$ (vel σου) W^{supp}
Θ 1241

2:20 σοι P^{75*} : συ P^{75c} ς P^{66c} rell : om P^{66*}

3:2 σημεια α P^{75*} : σημεια P^{75c} ς rell

3:3 γεννηθην P^{75*} : γεννηθη P^{75c} ς rell

3:11 αα(μην scripturus erat) P^{75*} : αμην pri
$P^{75c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell (αμιν Θ)

3:16 εις αυτον P^{75*} ς P^{66} rell : επ αυτον P^{75c}
Ψ 083 : επ αυτω L : om 0141

4:5a εερχε... $P^{75*(?)}$: εερχεται P^{75c} :
ερχεται ς rell

4:5b ουν εις πολιν της σαμαρειας om P^{75*} : ουν εις πολιν της σαμαρειας P^{75c}(man 1 [in mg inf]) ς P^{66} rell (C^3 F pc om ουν, C^3 F H U al add ο ιησους ante εις, 726 add την ante πολιν, 579 add την post σαμαρειας) : ερχεται ουν εις πολιν της σαμαρειας om ℵ*

4:13 πως P^{75*} : πας P^{75c} ς rell

4:27 ειπειν P^{75*} : ειπεν P^{75c} ς rell

4:36 χαιρων P^{75*} : χαιρη P^{75c} ς P^{66} rell : χαιρει Ε Κ Γ Δ Θ Π* 1241 pm : χαρη D

4:38 κεκοπιακοσιν P^{75*vid} : κεκοπιακασιν P^{75c} ς rell : εκοπιασαν D

4:42 ειπα̅ (= ειπαν) P^{75*} : ελεγον P^{75c}(man 1) ς rell

4:47 ιαση P^{75*} : ιασηται P^{75c} ς rell (H S* al ιασεται)

4:52 κοψοτερον P^{75*} : κομψοτερον P^{75c} ς rell

5:5 λ̅η̅ P^{75*} 579 : λ̅η̅ ετη P^{75c}(man 2) ς P^{66c} rell (vel τριακοντα και [om ς pm] οκτω ετη) : ετη λ̅η̅ P^{66*} : μ̅ και η̅ ετη W^{supp}

5:6 πολλυν P^{75*} : πολυν P^{75c} ς rell

5:11 σοι P^{75*} : σου P^{75c} ς rell : om 726

5:19 αυτου P^{75*} : εαυτου P^{75c} ς rell

John

5:22a κρεινει P^{75*} : κρινει P^{75c} ς rell (-νη L M Θ al)

5:22b τεδωκεν P^{75*} : δεδωκεν P^{75c} ς rell

5:30 α̣[λ]λο P^{75*} : α̣[λ]λα P^{75c} ς rell

5:45 υμιν P^{75*} L 063 1241 pc : υμων pri P^{75c} ς P^{66} rell : υμας D* 472 1424 : om 1689

5:47 [π]ιστευετ̣ε sec P^{75*} P^{66} B V Π* 235 pc : [π]ιστευσετ̣ε P^{75c} ς Π^{2} rell : πιστευσητε D G S W Δ Θ (-σιτε) f^{1} f^{13} 28 565 579 1010 1241 1424 2768 al

6:17 και ηδη̣ P^{75*} : και tert (ante ουπω vel ουκ) P^{75c} ς rell

6:50 [αυτο]υ̣ P^{75*} : [αυτο]υ̣ [φαγ]η̣ $P^{75c^{vid}}$ ς rell (E pc φαγει)

6:54 το P^{75*} : την $P^{75c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell

6:59 συνα̣γω P^{75*} : συνα̣γωγη P^{75c} ς rell (-γει Θ)

7:3 σοι P^{75*} : σου̣ sec P^{75c} ς P^{66} $\aleph^{c}$ rell : om ℵ* D U 1241 pc (item sed add συ ante ποιεις G Θ f^{1} 565 pc)

7:43 σχιμα P^{75*} B* : σχισμα P^{75c} ς P^{66} B^{3} rell

8:14 ε[ρχο]μαι και P^{75*} ς rell : ε[ρχο]μαι η P^{75c} P^{66} B D K N T U X Λ Ψ 0110 0250 f^{1} 700^{c} 2768 al

8:18 περι εμου μαρτυρει P^{75*} : μαρτυρει περι εμου $P^{75c\text{(man 1)}}$ ς rell

John

8:19a ουτε pri P^{75*} ς rell : ουδε pri P^{75c}

8:19b ουτε sec P^{75*} ς rell : ουδε sec $P^{75c\,vid}$
T Or^{pt}

8:41 ουκ εγεννημεθα P^{75*} $ℵ^{*}$ L T 070 983 :
ου γεγεννημεθα P^{75c} $ℵ^{c}$ D^{1} rell : ου
γεγενημεθα P^{66} N W 0250 f^{13} 28 33 565 1010 al :
ουκ εγεννηθημεν B D^{*} et 2 409

8:46 αμαρτειας P^{75*} : αμαρτιας P^{75c} ς rell

8:50 κρινων P^{75*} ς B^{3} rell : κρεινων P^{75c} B^{*}

8:56 ιδεη P^{75*} : ιδεν P^{75c} ς rell (ς P^{66} ℵ B D
pm ειδεν)

9:6 αυτον P^{75*} : αυτου P^{75c} P^{66} ℵ A B C^{2} L N Θ
f^{1} 33 157 565 579 1071 1241 1321 pc :
om ς C^{*} rell

9:10 σοι P^{75*} $ς^{e}$ 124 it : σου P^{75c} ς rell it^{b,r^1}

9:30 απεκριθη δ ο P^{75*}: απεκριθη ο P^{75c} ς P^{66c}
(P^{66*} transpon ο ανθρωπος) rell

10:10 τι μη P^{75*} : ει μη P^{75c} ς rell (ει μι 1241,
B scripsit ιν post ερχεται sed scriba ipse
correxit)

10:40 ιωανη̣ς P^{75*} B D : ιωαννη̣ς P^{75c} ς P^{45} P^{66} rell

11:3 [ασθεν]ε̣ι απεστειλαν ουν αι αδελφ̣[αι προς αυτ]ο̣ν
P^{75*} : [ασθεν]ε̣ι P^{75c}(man 1^{vid}) ς rell (579
ασθενης)

John

11:41 ηκο̣[υσα]ς̣ P^{75*} ς rell : supra ηκουσας litteras paucas scripsit P$^{75c(man\ 3)}$

12:18 οχλος P^{75*} א W 69 pc : ο οχλος P^{75c} ς P^{66} rell : οχλοι D

12:31 ε̣κ̣β̣λ̣η̣σ(εται scripturus erat) P^{75*} : ε̣κ̣β̣λ̣η̣θησεται P$^{75c(man\ 1)}$ ς rell : βληθησεται P^{66} D Θ 1093

12:36a ως P^{75*vid} א A B D L W Θ Π* Ψ 33 579 pc : ε̣ως P^{75cvid} ς P^{66} Π^{3} rell

12:36b γενη[σθ]ε̣ P^{75*vid} ς rell : γενν̣η[σθ]ε̣ P^{75cvid}

APPENDIX B

P^{46} AND THE ETHIOPIC VERSION

The methodology of our study presupposes that occasional agreements from versional or Patristic evidence for the singular readings of a manuscript are likely to be coincidental, and do not provide a reason for removing such readings from our list of singulars.[1] However, such ignoring of versional agreements will lead to an inappropriate analysis whenever the agreements are in fact the results of a genealogical relationship. Thus, to refer again to the clearest example of such non-coincidental agreement,[2] the agreements between D and the Old Latin point (at least in many cases) to an ancestor of these later witnesses, and a study of the characteristics of the scribe of D would have to concentrate on the readings of D which differ not only from the other continous-text Greek manuscripts but also from the Old Latin manuscripts.

The possibility of a similar textual relationship between P^{46} and the Ethiopic version (eth) was raised by Hoskier in the course of several studies devoted to P^{46}. In fact, Hoskier cites 53 readings where eth "is practically alone in support of P^{46}."[3] And Metzger refers to "these surprising statistics" as being the sole contribution to our understanding of the Ethiopic version of the Pauline Epistles.[4] However, Hoskier in fact mentions a few (presumed) readings of eth in his article on P^{46}, and also often cites eth in support of "the rarer omissions" of P^{46},[5] which he elsewhere lists in full.[6] Moreover, his list of 53 readings is compiled "without taking account of Hebrews."[7] However, Hoskier frequently refers to eth as (presumably) supporting readings of P^{46} in Hebrews,[8] and many of these alleged agreements have already been discussed in the notes to Chapter III above. In order to place some convenient limit on the scope of this investigation, I here restrict attention to the 53 readings[9] especially emphasized by Hoskier; in fact, similar difficulties as are found in these also arise with his other citations. But it would appear that these 53 readings are meant to be the clearest cases of such support, and, since they turn out to have virtually no probative value, it is reasonable to ignore the other examples cited by Hoskier from time to time.

First, though, it must be granted that it is *prima facie* intelligible that a connection would exist between P^{46} and eth. P^{46} comes from Egypt and displays clear affinities with textual witnesses of the Alexandrian type, especially with B.[10] The geographical proximity of Egypt and Ethiopia makes it plausible that manuscripts to which P^{46} had a close relationship should have found their way south to Ethiopia. And in fact, according to reports in ancient ecclesiastical sources, Frumentius, having already preached Christianity in Ethiopia in the middle of the fourth century, traveled to Alexandria where he was consecrated as bishop by Athanasius. He was then sent back to Ethiopia, and it would be natural (we may imagine) for Frumentius to have carried with him Greek manuscripts for the nourishment of the faith. What is more likely than that these texts would have been of the Alexandrian type? And thus a textual basis akin to that now found in P^{46} would have been introduced into Ethiopia at the earliest period, there to make its presence felt eventually in the Ethiopic version.[11]

Although the textual bases of eth remain a matter of debate,[12] some scholars have claimed to find indications which would confirm a relationship with Alexandrian witnesses.[13] The agreements cited by Hoskier would appear to be conclusive (and he certainly took them as such), and indeed not merely to support a finding that eth falls into the Alexandrian textual family (at least in part). For one would expect that only a quite direct textual connection would result in 53 readings where P^{46} departs from all or almost all continuous-text Greek manuscripts but still agrees with eth. What we would then have would be, instead of scribal errors on the part of P^{46} and translational errors or freedoms on the part of eth, readings which must go back to the second century (at least), and have, thanks to some peculiar feature in the transmission of the text, survived in only these two witnesses. Hoskier in fact saw such agreements with eth (as well as with other versions) as evidence that P^{46} was often correct even in its singular readings, and sometimes even when it had what were considered to be nonsense readings.[14]

While all this appears to be plausible, it turns out that after all there is no reason to believe that it is true. Upon closer study the alleged agreements between P^{46} and eth largely disappear,[15] and the ones which remain are probably due to coincidence.

Rather than deal with the presumed agreements in the Biblical order, it will (I believe) be more perspicuous to treat them under various categories:[16]

I. The syntactical features of Ethiopic make it impossible to cite eth for the Greek variation in question.

II. Eth simply does not support P^{46}.

III. Eth's reading supports another reading just as much as the reading of P^{46}.

IV. Eth has a larger variation which disagrees with P^{46}.

V. Eth does support P^{46}, but in a reading which does not necessarily indicate a special textual relation between eth and P^{46}.

I believe that all the readings cited by Hoskier fall into one of these categories, and thus that his argument is without foundation.

A complication in several of these readings is that the two editions of eth differ. In such cases, eth^{ro} is the editio princeps of the Ethiopic New Testament, first printed in Rome in 1548-49, and reprinted in Walton's polyglott in 1657.[17] Eth^{PP} is the Platt-Praetorius text issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1899, and reprinted most recently by the American Bible Society in 1968.[18]

I

Two of the supposed agreements cited by Hoskier rest on nothing more than confusion about the syntactic resources available in Ethiopic. First, Ethiopic is lacking both definite and indefinite articles. There are several ways of expressing determination, but their absence does not necessarily reflect the absence of the definite article in the Greek Vorlage.[19] Consequently, Hoskier's citation of eth as agreeing with P^{46}'s omission of ο before ελευθερος at 1 Cor 7:22 is unwarranted.[20]

Secondly, like the other Semitic languages Ethiopic possesses neither comparative nor superlative forms of adjectives.[21] Therefore, Hoskier is unjustified in claiming support from eth for P^{46}'s reading of μακαρια in place of μακαριωτερα at 1 Cor 7:40.

II

At the following places eth simply does not support P^{46}, and in fact usually just translates the majority reading.

Ro 15:29. P^{46} has τε for δε. Eth, however, has ወእተአመን፡ ባሕቱ , and ባሕቱ is an adversative particle which with a preceding ወ equals δε.[22] So eth just translates the majority reading.

Ro 15:30. P^{46} B omit αδελφοι. Eth^{pp} has አኀዊነ (= αδελφοι ημων), but eth^{ro} does support the omission.

1 Cor 11:14. P^{46} reads η φυσις αυτης. Eth^{pp} has ወፍጥረታሂ , while eth^{ro} has ወፍጥረታኒ (translated as: Et natura ejus). Hoskier follows the Latin, as it appears, but in fact both suffixes ሂ and ኒ correspond to intensive αυτη.[23] So eth just renders the majority reading η φυσις αυτη.

1 Cor 11:29. P^{46} ℵ* A B C* 6 33 1739 pc omit αναξιως. Eth^{ro} also omits, but eth^{pp} has እንዘ፡ኢይደልዎ (literally = *as is not worthy of him*), obviously a rendering of αναξιως.

1 Cor 14:18. P^{46} reads υπερ παντων for παντων. Eth^{ro} agrees, but eth^{pp} adds እስመ (= οτι) after θεω.

1 Cor 15:47. The continuous-text Greek manuscripts divide as follows:

ο δευτερος ανθρωπος ο κυριος εξ ουρανου ℵ^{c} D^{b,c} 1739^{mg} ς rell : ο δευτερος ανθρωπος εξ ουρανου ℵ* B C D* 0243 6 33 424** 1739* pc : ο δευτερος ανθρωπος πνευματικος εξ ουρανου P^{46} : ο δευτερος ανθρωπος εξ ουρανου ο ουρανιος F G. Eth has ወዳግም፡ብእሲ፡እምሰማይ፡ሰማያዊ (= *et secundus homo e caelo caelestis*). Hoskier evidently took *caelestis* as supporting πνευματικος, but ሰማያዊ just corresponds to ουρανιος,[24] and thus eth supports the reading of F G (as Tischendorf notes).

2 Cor 1:5. P^{46} omits ημων after παρακλησις. However, eth^{pp} renders this ημων with its ፍሥሐነ. Eth^{ro}, on the other hand, has ፍሥሐሁ፡ለክርስቶስ (= *consolatio Christi*). So eth^{ro} has just replaced the ημων of most witnesses by the equivalent of χριστου.

2 Cor 5:9. P^{46} Ψ 1108 1611 1739 omit και after διο. But eth has ወይእዜኒ (= *et nunc*), and so has ወ for και.

2 Cor 5:19. P^{46} has το ευαγγελιον for του (om F G) ευαγγελιου τον λογον of D* F G, or for τον λογον of the other manuscripts. Eth has መልእክት (= *ministerium*), which is simply repeated here from vs. 18, where it renders διακονια.[25] There is no justification for taking this word as rendering το ευαγγελιον, which would be ወንጌል or, less likely, ብሥራት.[26]

2 Cor 9:2. P^{46} has οτι οιδα γαρ for οιδα γαρ. Eth has the conjunction እስመ, but this just renders γαρ.[27] Eth continues by translating την προθυμιαν υμων as ከመ:ትጸሀቁ (= *quod soliciti eratis*), and Hoskier may have taken this *quod* as equivalent to P^{46}'s οτι. But eth in fact provides no support for P^{46}'s hardly sensical reading.

2 Cor 10:12. P^{46} omits, by homoeoteleuton, η συγκριναι. Despite Hoskier's claim that eth is in support, eth in fact has both ናፍብዕ and ንሐሊ, first person plural subjunctives corresponding to εγκριναι and συγκριναι.[28]

Ga 3:28 *bis*. P^{46} has ουκετι for ουκ ενι pri and sec (but is not extant for ουκ ενι tert). Eth has አልቦ six times in the verse: three times for ουκ ενι, twice for ουδε, and once for και. Moreover, አልቦ just means *non est*, *non datur*.[29] So eth provides no support for P^{46} here.

Php 1:11. P^{46} has εις δοξαν θεου και επαινον εμοι instead of εις δοξαν και επαινον θεου of most manuscripts or εις δοξαν και επαινον μοι of F G. Eth^{ro} has በስብሐቲሁ:

ወእኰቴቱ፡ለእግዚአብሔር (= in gloria ejus et laude [ejus] dei), while eth^{pp} reads በስብሐተ፡እግዚአብሔር፡ወእኰቴቱ (= in gloria dei et laude ejus). Both are simply renderings of the majority text: eth^{ro} has added the proleptic pronouns ሁ and ū,[30] and eth^{pp} has replaced the first pronoun by the noun. Neither provides any support for P^{46}.

Php 3:5. P^{46} reads περιτομης οκταημερος instead of περιτομη οκταημερος. Hoskier adds "(εκ)," and with this addition one would have the reading of eth^{ro}: እምግዝረት (= ex circumcisione). However, P^{46} doesn't have this εκ. Eth^{pp}, on the other hand, has ግዙር (= circumcisus), and so doesn't support P^{46} either.

Col 1:12. P^{46} 1175 add και before ευχαριστουντες (and αμα is added by P^{46} B afterwards). Eth, however, has no connective at all.

Col 1:23. For και μη P^{46} reads, it seems, δ̣[ε]. Eth^{pp} supports και μη with its ወኢ(የንቀለቅሉ). Eth^{ro}, on the other hand, reads እንዘ፡ኢ(የንቀለቅሉ), and Hoskier took this as supporting the simple omission of και which he thought was the reading of P^{46}. Even apart from the fact that this seems not to be the reading of P^{46} (and both eth^{ro} and eth^{pp} clearly have the negation ኢ), እንዘ is just a conjunction which here should doubtless be taken as representing the majority Greek text.[31]

III

In a number of further cases eth supports another Greek reading (usually the majority reading) just as much as that of P^{46}.[32]

Ro 9:2. Hoskier reports P^{46} as omitting μοι after λυπη, but in fact it certainly reads μ̣ο̣ι̣ [λ]υπη, thus agreeing with 440.[33] Eth has እቴክዝ , which just corresponds to λυπομαι,[34] and thus is an adequate rendering of the majority reading in Greek.

Ro 12:4. P^{46} 1311 omit γαρ. Eth has በከመ , translated as quemadmodum, which Hoskier evidently took as equivalent to καθαπερ (D* F G have ωσπερ) without γαρ. But eth frequently gives no equivalent of γαρ with በከመ . E.g., at Mt 24:38 ως (ℵ B L 33 579 892*, ωσπερ rell) γαρ is rendered በከመ in eth^{pp} (ከመ in eth^{ro}); at Lk 11:30 καθως γαρ (ωσπερ γαρ 998, καθως alone ℵ 239 544 pc) is rendered ወበከመ; and at Jn 5:21 ωσπερ (ως ℵ) γαρ is also rendered ወበከመ. Finally, at the only other New Testament occurrence of καθαπερ γαρ, 1 Cor 12:12 (where K 206 omit γαρ), eth again has ወበከመ. So eth cannot be cited as supporting the omission of γαρ at Ro 12:4.[35]

Ro 13:12. P^{46*} adds ουν after ενδυσωμεθα, while P^{46c} deletes ουν to agree with ℵ* 6 in having no copula. Eth has ወ here, which Hoskier takes as rendering the ουν of P^{46*}, even though the Latin of eth^{ro} translates it as et. However, ወ is utilized to translate a wide range of Greek conjunctions: και, τε, δε, η, αλλα, as well as ουν.[36] Consequently, eth could also be rendering either και ενδυσωμεϑα ($\aleph^c$ C^3 $D^{b,c}$ F G L Ψ pm) or ενδυσωμεϑα δε (A B C* D* P 048 630 1506 1739 1881 pc).

Ro 15:19. P^{46} has τε και for και pri. One would hardly expect that this distinction would necessarily be reflected in a translation, and in fact eth sometimes has ወ for τε and sometimes fails to express τε at all. See, e.g., Ro 1:14 where τε και is rendered twice as ወ ... ወ , whereas at Ro 1:16 τε ... και is rendered simply as ወ.[37] Conversely, eth often has ወ where there is no Greek equivalent: see Ro 1:1 where ወ is added before the translation of αποστολος κλητος, Ro 1:2 where ወ is added before the rendering of εν γραφαις αγιαις, and Ro 1:29 and 1:31 where several occurrences of ወ are inserted.[38] Consequently, the doubled ወ in Ro 15:19 does not necessarily reflect a Greek τε και (or και ... και).

1 Cor 15:12. P^{46} omits οτι sec, and eth has no equivalent. However, eth frequently does not render οτι recitativum; see the following examples where οτι is firm in the Greek manuscripts: Lk 2:23, 5:36; Ro 8:36; 1 Cor 14:21.[39] Consequently, eth does not support P^{46}'s omission.

1 Cor 16:7. P^{46} 489 have αρτι υμας for υμας αρτι. Eth has ይእዜ፡ ኅሊፈ፡ እርአየክሙ (= nunc transeundo videre vos), with υμας expressed by ክሙ. Eth's order is not really that of P^{46}, but in fact eth is here simply exhibiting the tendency of Ethiopic (and other Semitic languages) to utilize pronominal suffixes where Greek has the pronoun before the verb.[40] See, e.g., Jn 7:19 where τι με ζητειτε αποκτειναι is translated ለምንት፡ እንከ፡ ተኀሥሡ፡ ትቅትሉኒ with ኒ corresponding to με.

2 Cor 2:14. P^{46} omits δε, and eth has no conjunction. However, eth's rendering of χαρις δε τω θεω and τω δε θεω χαρις is not uniform. The textual evidence is as follows:

Ro 6:17	δε	: om eth^{pp}, ∞ eth^{ro}
7:25	δε (om B)[41]	: om eth
1 Cor 15:57	δε	: ∞ eth
2 Cor 2:14	δε (om P^{46})	: om eth
8:16	δε	: om eth
9:15	δε (om P^{46} ℵ* B C* D* F G 33 1739 pc)	: ∞ eth

This pattern suggests that eth does not necessarily render δε in such a phrase, and that the "agreement" with B at Ro 7:25 and with P^{46} at 2 Cor 2:14 is likely to be accidental.

2 Cor 4:16. P^{46} 1739 add και after διο. Eth^{pp} has ወበእንተዝ (= et propterea), while eth^{ro} has ወይእዜኒ

(= et nunc, ergo, igitur[42]). The presence of ወ does not necessarily indicate the presence of και in the Greek Vorlage, as noted above under Ro 15:19. Furthermore, the rendering of διο alone often includes ወ; examples are:[43]

Ac 15:19 διο : ወይእዜኒ eth
20:31 διο : ወይእዜኒ eth^{pp}, ይእዜኒ eth^{ro}
25:26 διο (add και 1838) : ወይእዜኒ eth
26:3 διο : ወይእዜኒ eth^{ro}, om eth^{pp}
27:25 διο : ወይእዜኒ eth^{pp}, በእንተዝ eth^{ro}
27:34 διο (add και B) : ወዮምኒ (= et nunc) eth^{pp}, በእንተዝ eth^{ro}

Therefore, the presence of ወ at 2 Cor 4:16 does not presuppose και, and thus does not support P^{46} 1739.

2 Cor 6:16. P^{46} 69 omit οτι, and eth has no equivalent. This is, however, another example of οτι recitativum (see 1 Cor 15:12 above), and thus should not be viewed as an omission with support from eth.

2 Cor 8:5. P^{46} 547 have θεω for κυριω. Eth reads እግዚአብሔር, which may translate θεος, but equally well may render κυριος when it means God.[44] The translator could easily have taken κυριος as having that meaning here,

and so eth should not be cited as supporting P^{46} 547.

2 Cor 10:10. P^{46} omits μεν, and eth has no equivalent. It is indeed the case that Ethiopic has the particle ሰ, which often renders μεν. But it happens that μεν is fairly often not rendered in eth. See, e.g., Jn 19:32 and 1 Cor 9:24, where all the Greek manuscripts have μεν, but eth has no equivalent. So the absence of ሰ at 2 Cor 10:10 does not imply the absence of μεν in the Greek *Vorlage*.[45]

2 Cor 12:6. P^{46} omits εις, reading simply εμε λογισηται. Eth has ይትሐዘቡኒ (= *reputent me*), thus expressing (εις) εμε by ኒ. There is no precise parallel to this construction (λογιζομαι εις τινα),[46] but the use of a pronominal suffix for a preposition and pronoun is regular enough.[47] See Lk 5:36, where ελεγεν ... προς αυτους is rendered ይቤሎሙ, with ሎሙ corresponding to προς αυτους. There is no reason to suppose that eth is here agreeing with f^{13}, which has αυτοις for προς αυτους. And, by the way, P^{46}'s omission of εις at 2 Cor 12:6 is most likely just the result of a scribal leap: TICEICEME.

Eph 1:15. P^{46} adds ημων after κυριω. Actually, P^{46} has εν τω κυριω ημων ιησου, and eth reads በእግዚእነ፡ ኢየሱስ፡ ክርስቶስ (= *in domino nostro Iesu Christo*). However, eth regularly has እግዚእነ (= *dominus noster*) where the Greek has κυριος alone. Cf. 1 Cor 11:23, 2 Cor 4:5, and

2 Cor 4:14, where κυριος without pronoun in any Greek manuscript (including P^{46}, which is extant at each place) is translated እግዚእነ .[48] Therefore, eth should not be cited as supporting P^{46} at Eph 1:15.

Eph 5:4. P^{46} 629 1518 have και ευτραπελια instead of η ευτραπελια. Of course, the change here is tempting after the previous και ... και; A D* F G 81 104 pc have substituted η for these so as to give η ... η ... η.[49] Eth^{pp} has ወ at all three places, while eth^{ro} omits the first (but the Latin has et anyway) and has ወ at the other two places. Since ወ renders several Greek particles (see under Ro 13:12 above), there is no way to tell which sequence of conjunctions eth is rendering here.

Ga 3:21. P^{46} B have εν νομω for εκ νομω. Eth^{ro} has ለውእቱ፡ሕግ , and eth^{pp} has በውእቱ፡ሕግ . (Note that the difference here is simply between ለ and በ.) Eth^{ro} thus has the dative (τω) νομω, but eth^{pp} utilizes በ , which does roughly correspond to εν. However, at Ga 3:18 εκ (δια P^{46}) νομου is also translated by በ, as is εξ επαγγελιας. Indeed, in Romans 1 alone በ renders εκ (vs. 17), κατα (vs. 3), δια (vss. 5,8), υπερ (vs. 5), the genitive (vs. 6), as well as εν (vs. 4).[50] So it is clear that በ in Ga 3:21 could translate the εκ of the majority text.[51]

IV

In several other places eth alters the text considerably from that found in P^{46}.

Ro 15:28. P^{46vid} pr^{sp} B 209 1913 omit αυτοις. Eth omits any equivalent to αυτοις τον καρπον τουτον, probably because the meaning was unclear.[52]

1 Cor 8:2. P^{46} omits τι. Eth also omits τι, but further changes the construction by translating δοκει εγνωκεναι (or ειδεναι) τι as ይብል፡ አእመርኩ (= dicit "cognovi").

1 Cor 10:3-4. P^{46} has το without αυτο twice. (A 181 also omit; C* omits only the first αυτο.)[53] However, eth's support is not clear. For το αυτο πνευματικον βρωμα it has እክለ፡ዘመንፈስ፡ ቅዱስ (= escam spiritus sancti). And for το αυτο πνευματικον πομα eth^{ro} has ዘውእቱ፡ መንፈስ፡ ቅዱስ (= quod fuit spiritus sancti), while eth^{pp} has ስቴ፡ መንፈሳዊ (= potionem spiritualem). Support for P^{46}'s omission would thus be at most from eth^{pp} at vs. 4.

2 Cor 3:1. P^{46} omits η before εξ, thus reading (nonsensically) προς υμας εξ υμων. Eth, however, has the equivalent of προς υμας εξ ημων.

2 Cor 3:6. P^{46} reads ως for ος. Hoskier claims that eth supports this. However, eth^{pp} adequately renders the majority Greek text (with the relative ዘ for ος), although eth^{pp} does translate the preceding αλλα by እስመ , which is usually equivalent to οτι or ως. Eth^{ro}, on the other hand, has omitted, apparently by some transcriptional error, much of the text in eth^{pp}, and reads for αλλ -- ικανωσεν ημας: እስመ፡ እግዚአብሔር፡ ረሰየነ (= quia deus constituit nos). Eth^{ro} thus omits the relative pronoun ος by running the clauses together, and the እስመ which really translates αλλα was taken by Hoskier to equal ως. In fact, P^{46}'s reading is just an orthographic confusion.

2 Cor 10:7. For χριστου sec P^{46} has ο χριστος. Eth has no equivalent of αυτος, and in fact eth's ክርስቶስ could be genitive as well as nominative.[54] While P^{46} has καθως αυτος ο χριστος ουτως και ημεις, eth represents καθως (ο) χριστος ουτως και ημεις. That the Ethiopic translator did not understand Paul's construction here is indicated by the earlier rendering of ει τις πεποιθεν εαυτω χριστου ειναι τουτο λογιζεσθω παλιν εφ (or αφ) εαυτου as: ወዘሂ፡ ተአመነ፡ በክርስቶስ፡ ከመዝ፡ ለየሐሊ፡ ለሊሁ (= et qui confidit in Christo, sic consideret seipsum).

Eph 2:1. P^{46} adds υμων after παραπτωμασιν, thus reading τοις παραπτωμασιν υμων και ταις αμαρτιαις υμων. Eth, on the other hand, has for this merely በኃጢአትክሙ (= in peccatis vestris). Hoskier takes this as equivalent to τοις παραπτωμασιν υμων, and presumes that eth omits και ταις αμαρτιαις υμων.[55] But in fact ኃጢአት can render αμαρτια just as well as παραπτωμα.[56] There is thus the possibility that eth represents ταις αμαρτιαις υμων. However, the probable explanation here seems to be that the translator, not knowing how to distinguish παραπτωμα from αμαρτια,[57] simply let ኃጢአት stand for παραπτωμασιν-και-αμαρτιαις. Consequently, eth's ክሙ renders the single υμων of the majority text.

Col 2:15. P^{46} B add και before εδειγματισεν. Eth^pp and eth^ro differ considerably here, but they agree in having a finite verb prior to this εδειγματισεν, whereas the Greek has a participle. Eth^pp repeats አስተኃፍሮሙ (= εδειγματισεν αυτους), the second time with ወ prefixed. Eth^ro has ወሠለበሙ: ... ወአርአየ (= et expoliavit ... et monstravit). So in both cases the ወ is simply the normal connective in eth's paratactic rendering of the majority text in Greek.

V

In the remaining cases eth (or at least one of the editions of eth) does agree with P^{46}.

Ro 15:5. P^{46} reads ημιν for υμιν, and eth agrees (its የሀበነ renders δωη ημιν). The confusion of the first and second person plural pronouns is, of course, very frequent in the New Testament witnesses.[58] Indeed, besides Ro 15:5, P^{46} is alone among Greek manuscripts in reading the first person plural for the second person plural at the following readings: He 10:35; 2 Cor 7:11a, 7:15a, 9:14a, 9:14b; Eph 3:13. Eth reads the second person plural pronoun at each of these places, but it displays its own aberrations. See, e.g., Ro 15:1, where οφειλομεν δε ημεις is translated as ወርቱዕሰ: አንትሙ (= *et aequum est ut vos*), against the entire Greek tradition.[59] Since P^{46} exhibits a tendency to move to the first person plural pronoun, it is most likely that its reading at Ro 15:5 is the result of this scribal propensity, and that eth has just happened to make the same change there.

Ro 15:30. P^{46} B and eth^{ro} agree in omitting αδελφοι.

Ro 16:7. P^{46} 6 read ιουλιαν for ιουνιαν, with support from many versional witnesses: it^{ar,c,gig,x,z} vg$^{am,lugd\ 1569}$ cop^{bo}, as well as from eth (which has ዩልያን) and Ambst.

1 Cor 9:8. P^{46} 1831 and eth agree in omitting ταυτα pri.

1 Cor 10:4. P^{46} A 181 and perhaps eth^{pp} agree in omitting αυτο.

1 Cor 11:29. P^{46} ℵ* A B C* 6 33 1739 pc and eth^{ro} omit αναξιως.

1 Cor 13:13. P^{46} and eth have the order: μενει τα τρια ταυτα πιστις ελπις αγαπη.[60]

1 Cor 14:18. P^{46} and eth^{ro} agree in adding υπερ before παντων.

1 Cor 14:36. P^{46} and eth transpose εξηλθεν to after υμων.

1 Cor 15:45. P^{46} and eth omit αδαμ sec.

1 Cor 16:6. P^{46} and eth omit δε.

Ga 2:7. P^{46} C P 33 69 pc have ειδοτες for ιδοντες, and eth (with አእሚሮሙ) agrees.

Php 2:5. P^{46} B and eth have ημιν for υμιν. See the comment on Ro 15:5 above.

Php 2:7. P^{46} reads ανθρωπου (with significant Patristic support) for ανθρωπων. Eth has ብእሲ , the singular homo, and thus appears to agree; however, there seems to be no plural of this word available.[61]

There are thus 14 readings from Hoskier's original 53 where we find eth in agreement with P^{46}. However, in 3 of these (Ro 15:30, 1 Cor 11:29, and 1 Cor 14:18) the agreement is with eth^{ro} only, while at 1 Cor 10:4 the agreement is with eth^{PP} only.

When we look more closely, though, at these agreements we see that they prove very little, if anything, about the relationship between P^{46} and eth. In the first place, P^{46} has important support from Greek manuscripts at Ro 15:30, 1 Cor 10:4, 1 Cor 11:29, Ga 2:7, and Php 2:5. Similarly, P^{46} receives significant support from other witnesses at Ro 16:7 and Php 2:7. So, in fully 7 of these 14 readings Hoskier's claim that eth "is practically alone in support of" P^{46} is at least partially misleading.

Moreover, 6 of these 14 are omissions, and we have seen that P^{46} has a clear tendency to omit.[62] And, while comparably precise figures for the Ethiopic version are not available, there is at least some evidence that the Ethiopic translators also had a tendency to abridge.[63] Metzger, for example, relies on a study by Montgomery to state: "The most marked characteristic of the Ethiopic text of Acts in this rather imperfect copy [Parisinus Bibl. Nat. aeth. 26] is its brevity."[64] Similarly, Hackspill found that one of the characteristics of Parisinus Bibl. Nat. aeth. 22 (his 32) was: "einfachere, gewöhnlichere, kürzere Ausdrücke vorzuziehen, besonders wenn er den betr. griechischen Ausdruck nicht recht versteht."[65] Indeed, the general inexactness of eth has been remarked upon by several scholars, and is apparent at many texts.[66]

Consequently, since both P^{46} and eth show tendencies to omit, it could easily happen that they would coincidentally omit the same word at least a few times in the course of the Pauline Epistles. Naturally, the agreement might not be coincidental, but a few omissions in common hardly provide clear evidence of a genealogical relationship.

Coincidence may similarly account for the two transpositions: 1 Cor 13:13 and 1 Cor 14:36.[67] The scribe of P^{46} has clearly created quite a few transpositions (37 of them singular readings[68]), and any translation from Greek into a Semitic language would certainly involve some changes in word order.[69] So an occasional agreement between P^{46} and eth could well be coincidental.

At least two of the remaining readings may be the results of independent harmonizations to context. P^{46} is, of course, subject to the influence of the context,[70] and eth also frequently harmonizes.[71] Thus, the agreement at 1 Cor 14:18, where the preceding ευχαριστω could have misled,[72] and the agreement at Php 2:7, where the following ανθρωπος could have had influence,[73] have little weight.

The agreement at Ro 16:7 could result from independent harmonization to 16:15,[74] if it is not simply an independent "clerical error."[75] In any case, P^{46} and eth have significant support for this reading.

Two of the readings involve the common confusion of pronouns: Ro 15:5 and Php 2:5. And the one remaining reading, Ga 2:7, involves another frequent confusion.

None of these 14 readings, therefore, is of such a nature that coincidental agreement is unlikely. On the contrary, they all are rather minor variations which are common in Greek manuscripts and versions in general, and in P^{46} and eth in particular. To the extent, then, that P^{46} and eth may be "practically alone" in agreement, this agreement can readily be explained as coincidence. Consequently, it is reasonable to permit those singular readings of P^{46} which find support in eth to stand as creations of the scribe of P^{46}.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Chapter I, pp. 45-48. Colwell's remarks (see Chapter I, p. 46) on the agreements between the singular readings of P^{66} and the Revised Standard Version indicate clearly that such coincidental agreement is possible. Several comments by Metzger in his "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," *New Testament Studies*, 18 (1971-72), pp. 379-400, are relevent to versional evidence as well; see the references to "freedom in translation" (p. 388 and p. 391), and the description of certain minor variations as "variations which might well occur independently in more than one witness, or might be occasioned, in the case of versional testimony, by the freedom of the translator" (p. 395).

[2] See Chapter I, pp. 46-47.

[3] *Appendix to an Article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles Known as P^{46}* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), p. 5. Hoskier refers to this same point in "A Study," pp. 149-50.

[4] *Early Versions*, p. 236 (and see also p. 232). Josef Hofmann, "Das Neue Testament in äthiopischer Sprache: Probleme der Übersetzung und Stand der Forschung," *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, ed. Kurt Aland, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 5 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972), p. 364, also cites only Hoskier's *Appendix*.

[5] "A Study," p. 162.

[6] *P^{46}: Addenda et corrigenda* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937), pp. 3-8.

[7] *Appendix*, p. 5.

[8] In his *A Commentary*.

[9] I count 53 readings by counting as two readings the omissions of το αυτο at 1 Cor 10:3 and 10:4, and by counting as two readings the two occurrences of ουκετι for ουκ ενι at Ga 3:28.

[10] See Chapter III, pp. 182-83.

[11] What is known of the history of the Ethiopic version is presented by Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 215-23.

[12] *Ibid*., pp. 232-40; Hofmann, "Das Neue Testament." The debate is likely to remain inconclusive as long as no critical edition of eth (except for Revelation) is available.

[13] E.g., Zotenberg claimed that eth in the Gospels has an Alexandrian base, and Montgomery claimed to find some agreements with B alone or with B cop^{sa} alone (Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 232 and p. 235). In his *Text*, p. 84, Metzger says: "The analyses which have been made of the earlier form of the Ethiopic version disclose a mixed type of text, predominantly Byzantine in complexion, but with occasional agreement with certain early Greek witnesses (P^{46} and B) against all other witnesses."

However, Metzger is here relying on Hoskier for the agreement with P^{46}, and it also happens that the claim by James A. Montgomery, "The Ethiopic Text of Acts of the Apostles," *Harvard Theological Review*, 27 (1934), pp. 169-205, of agreement with B in Acts turns out to be rather dubious; see my "The Ethiopic Support for Codex Vaticanus in Acts," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 71 (1980), pp. 258-62.

[14] See, for instance, Chapter III, note 84.

[15] The cause of some of Hoskier's errors is that Hoskier could not, as it appears, control the Ethiopic itself. For, as far as can be judged from his comments on P^{46} and his remarks in his work on Revelation, he depends on the Latin rendering of eth^{ro} and on Horner's notes (and translation into English) in his edition of cop^{sa}. (Cf. Hoskier's *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, Vol. II, p. 9, where it is significant that Hoskier does not say precisely what his authority for eth is. A critical observation on Hoskier's use of versional evidence generally is made by Schmid, *Studien*, *Die alten Stämme*, pp. X-XI and p. 8.)

In any case, Hoskier seems to cite the Latin version of eth^{ro} or to rely on Horner when he gives the readings of eth at all. However, this Latin is known to be inaccurate (Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 230; Hofmann, "Das Neue Testament, pp. 346-47), and is even called "unusually bad" by Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 410. Of course it seems rather naive to imagine that one could usefully compare Greek and

Ethiopic by means of a Latin version of the latter, even if the version were skillfully executed. And this difficulty is exacerbated by the fact that almost all the claimed agreements with P^{46} involve minute matters. (Cf. Scrivener's general observation in *Introduction*, p. 311.)

[16] The material presented by Hofmann under the title "Limitations of Ethiopic in Representing Greek" (in Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 240-56) turns out to be not as helpful as one might wish for the purposes of textual criticism. Several remarks in the review by James Barr (*Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 30 [1979], pp. 290-303) are particularly relevant to the utilization of Hofmann's section on Ethiopic. Barr notes, for instance (p. 295): "The problem for a textual critic attempting to use a version will often be not that of knowing the 'limitations' of the language but that of knowing whether the version in question was in fact literal or not." And further (p. 300): "Indeed, many of the greatest difficulties for the critic arise not where the language has 'limitations' but where it can perfectly well mirror the Greek word order, the Greek construction, etc., but does not in fact do so."

An example of this phenomenon which is relevant to Hoskier's readings is the Ethiopic renderings of Greek conjunctions. In *Early Versions*, p. 250, we learn from Hofmann: "The quantity and significance of conjunctions available in Ethiopic are adequate, even though here and there a corresponding precision with the Greek is lacking." However, Hofmann elsewhere remarks: "Dagegen trifft man es viel häufiger an, dass aeth eine griechische Konjunktion anders als erwartet übersetzt" (*Die äthiopische Johannes-Apokalypse kritisch untersucht*, Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, Vol. 297, Subsidia, Tomus 33 [Louvain: Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, 1969], p. 98). Chapters V and VI of this latter work ("Charakteristik der Übersetzung," pp. 67-77; Übersetzungstechnik," pp. 78-105) are more valuable to the textual critic, since they focus on the actual manner in which the translator worked, rather than on the limitations of the language. It is true that the examples are there confined to Revelation, but many of the points apply equally well (as it seems) to the other portions of the Ethiopic New Testament.

[17] Cf. Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 228-29; Hofmann, "Das Neue Testament," pp. 346-47. I have used the 1964 reprint (see Introduction, note 14, above).

UMI

[18] Cf. Metzger, Early Versions, pp. 230-31; Hofmann, "Das Neue Testament," p. 347. I have used the 1968 reprint (see Introduction, note 14, above).

[19] August Dillmann, Ethiopic Grammar, 2d ed. revised by Carl Bezold, trans. by James A. Crichton (London: Williams & Norgate, 1907), §172; Hofmann in Metzger, Early Versions, p. 243; Hofmann, Johannes-Apokalypse, pp. 94-95.

[20] Is it conceivable that Hoskier thought that eth supported P^{46} here since the Latin version in eth^{ro} also (of course) fails to have an article before liber?

[21] Hofmann in Metzger, Early Versions, p. 243.

[22] See Mt 17:12, cited in Dillmann, Lexicon, col. 496.

[23] Ibid., col. 2 and cols. 628-29, where et ipse is given for each.

[24] Ibid., col. 341.

[25] Ibid., col. 49.

[26] Ibid., col. 918, col. 509, and index sub evangelium.

[27] Ibid., col. 747.

[28] For this rendering of infinitives see Hofmann in Metzger, Early Versions, pp. 248-49, and Hofmann, Johannes-Apokalypse, p. 70 and pp. 85-86. On the meanings of these two verbs see Dillmann, Lexicon, cols. 1231-32 (s. አጥብዐ: II,1) and cols. 577-78 (s. ተለየ I,2 [an orthographic variant of ሐለየ; cf. col. 68]).

[29] Dillmann, Lexicon, col. 717.

[30] On the addition of pronouns in the Ethiopic version, see Hofmann, Johannes-Apokalypse, pp. 68-69, p. 88, and especially p. 91: "Das Äthiopische gehört zu den Sprachen, die gern das Possessivpronomen gebrauchen, während das Griechische damit bedeutend sparsamer umgeht. Daraus ergibt sich schon, dass aeth viel häufiger ein Possessivpronomen anbringt, wo gr keines hat, als umgekehrt, dass nämlich bei aeth das Possessivum fehlt, während es bei gr steht."

[31] See Dillmann, *Lexicon*, col. 778, where a few cases of እንዘ rendering και are reported. The Latin version of eth^{ro} has *quum*.

[32] Evaluation of the Syriac evidence presents some of the same problems as that of Ethiopic. See, for example, the studies by James T. Clemons, "Some Questions on the Syriac Support for Variant Greek Readings," *Novum Testamentum*, 10 (1968), pp. 26-30, and Sebastian P. Brock, "The Treatment of Greek Particles in the Old Syriac Gospels, with Special Reference to Luke," *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, ed. J. K. Elliott, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 80-86.

[33] Kenyon's apparatus is not as clear as it might be, since he says: "Post οτι 2 vel 3 litt., fortasse μοι. λυπη] +μοι cett." Thus, P^{46} simply transposes, as the plate confirms.

[34] Dillmann, *Lexicon*, col. 567.

[35] Of the eighteen occurrences of γαρ in Romans 1-2, three (2:13, 2:25, 2:28) have no equivalent in eth, and one (1:9) has no equivalent in eth^{ro} but is rendered by ወ in ethPP.

[36] Dillmann, *Lexicon*, cols. 880-81. Examples of these six translations are: Mt 1:25, Ro 2:19, Mt 2:3, Mt 5:17, Jn 3:8, and Jn 7:33. (The only variation in Greek is at Jn 7:33, where 047 omits ουν.)

[37] Cf. also the rendering of τε και by ወ alone at He 5:1 (where P^{46} B D^{bvid} Ψ pc omit τε), and at He 5:7 (where K pc omit τε).

[38] See the remark of Hofmann, "Das Neue Testament," p. 365: "die äthiopischen Übersetzer gehen mit ወ nicht gerade sparsam um."

[39] At the following places a few Greek manuscripts agree--doubtless coincidentally--with eth in omitting οτι: Mt 26:75 (D), Mk 12:19 (D 69 115 213 1542), Jn 1:32 (V 22 1555), and He 11:18 (D P Ψ pc).

[40] See Hofmann, Johannes-Apokalypse, pp. 91-92.

[41] χαρις δε τω θεω, read by ℵ^a (B) C^2 Ψ 33 81 104 365 1506 pc, seems to be the Vorlage of eth's እኰቱ፡ እግዚ እብሔር . D 51 have η χαρις του θεου, F G have η χαρις κυριου, and the remaining manuscripts have ευχαριστω (76 1838 add δε) τω θεω.

[42] Dillmann, Lexicon, col. 1073.

[43] A further case is Ro 13:5, where διο αναγκη υποτασσεσθαι is translated ወይእዜኒ፡ (ethPP, eth^{ro} om ወ) በግብር፡ ተኰነኑ (= [et] nunc ex necessitate est ut subiecti sitis). Here D F G read διο υποτασσεσθε, and P^{46} has διο και υποτασσεσθε. There is no reason to cite ethPP as agreeing with P^{46} here.

[44] Dillmann, Lexicon, col. 1192. Cf. Hofmann, "Das Neue Testament," p. 365.

[45] Thus, at Ro 1:8 the omission of μεν in 61* 206** is not really supported by eth, despite Tischendorf's note.

[46] The phrase ελογισθη αυτω εις δικαιοσυνην (with minor variations) at Ro 4:3,5,9,22; Ga 3:6; and Jas 2:23 is rendered by eth in several different ways, but in none of them is ጽድቀ (= justitia) governed by a preposition.

[47] For a more modern example of the same fluctuation, compare the Revised Standard Version's "think more of me" with Luther's "mich höher achte" at 2 Cor 12:6 (italics added). Luther should not be taken as supporting P^{46}.

[48] There is textual variation at all three places (and at 2 Cor 4:14 P^{46} B pc omit κυριον); but it is clear that the Greek Vorlage of eth had κυριος without pronoun. See also note 30 above.

[49] Other manuscripts (P 365 1518 1739 2464 pc) have replaced και sec by η, and Ψ has replaced και pri by η.

[50] Tischendorf here cites eth's ወበመንፈሱ (= et per spiritum suum) as agreeing with Chrysostom's και πνευματι. But in view of eth's rendering of κατα σαρκα in vs. 3 as በሥጋ፡ ሰብእ (= in carne humana [literally in carne hominis]), eth in vs. 4 is surely just translating the κατα πνευμα of all Greek manuscripts.

[51] Hoskier, *A Commentary*, p. 49, remarks that Syriac ܒ "can mean anything." This hyperbolic comment could, with some justification, be used of Ethiopic በ (see Dillmann, *Lexicon*, cols. 478-81).

[52] See Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, *s.* σφραγιζω 2.d. Note also Hoskier's remark (*A Commentary*, p. 38) on He 6:1: "*aeth*^{ro} omits the clause, and that document often baulks when confronted with a difficulty."

[53] The omission could, of course, be due to homoeoteleuton.

[54] See Hofmann in Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 242.

[55] In "A Study," p. 160, Hoskier claims: "In *aeth* . . . we find plain omission of: και ταις αμαρτιαις υμων, which indicates something pre-B and pre-*pap*^{46}, for *pap*^{46} amplifies (with *syr boh*) by: τοις παραπτωμασιν υμων και ταις αμαρτιας υμων."

[56] Dillmann, *Lexicon*, col. 621. Note, for example, Ro 6:11, Eph 2:5, and Col 2:13, where ኀጢአት occurs throughout. Both Greek terms can also be rendered by አበሳ and ጌጋይ (*ibid*., col. 757 and col. 1200).

[57] This is the only New Testament passage where they occur together.

[58] Cf. Metzger, *Text*, pp. 191-92, and the examples of the sound confusion in Gignac, *Grammar*, pp. 262-65.

[59] See also Re 1:5-6, cited by Hofmann, "Das Neue Testament," p. 349.

[60] This is the order adopted in the New English Bible.

[61] Dillmann, *Lexicon*, col. 519: "nonnisi in Sing. usitatum."

[62] See Chapter III, pp. 254-60.

[63] See also Hoskier's remark in note 52 above.

[64] *Early Versions*, p. 235; cf. Montgomery, "The Ethiopic Text," p. 174 and pp. 179-83.

[65] L. Hackspill, "Die äthiopische Evangelienübersetzung," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 11 (1896), p. 146.

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 144-50; Montgomery, "The Ethiopic Text," pp. 172-83, 198-201.

[67] The first of these two is said by Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 565, to result "in a much more commonplace sequence."

[68] See Chapter III, pp. 260-62.

[69] Montgomery, "The Ethiopic Text," p. 175, remarks: "I may note a perversity common to Ethiopic scribes, that of transposition, e.g. [Acts] v. 14 'women and men.'"

[70] See Chapter III, pp. 263-67.

[71] Hackspill, "Evangelienübersetzung," pp. 147-50.

[72] See p. 264 above.

[73] See Chapter III, note 252.

[74] There eth has ዩልያ , by the way. C* F G have replaced ιουλιαν in 16:15 by ιουνιαν.

[75] Metzger, *Commentary*, p. 539, gives this explanation of the variants at 16:7 and 16:15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. EDITIONS OF THE PAPYRI

Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Vol. II: The Gospels and Acts, Text. London: Emery Walker, 1933. (P^{45})

________, ed. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Vol. II: The Gospels and Acts, Plates. London: Emery Walker, 1934. (P^{45})

Gerstinger, Hans. "Ein Fragment des Chester Beatty-Evangelienkodex in der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien." Aegyptus, 13 (1933), pp. 67-72. (P^{45})

Zuntz, Günther. "Reconstruction of one Leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P^{45})." Chronique d'Égypte, 26 (1951), pp. 191-211. (P^{45})

Sanders, Henry A., ed. A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXXVIII. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. (P^{46})

Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Vol. III, Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text. London: Emery Walker, 1936. (P^{46})

________, ed. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Vol. III, Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Plates. London: Emery Walker, 1937. (P^{46})

________, ed. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Vol. III: Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text. London: Emery Walker, 1934. (P^{47})

________, ed. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Vol. III: Revelation, Plates. London: Emery Walker, 1936. (P^{47})

Martin, Victor, ed. *Papyrus Bodmer II*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956. (P^{66})

________, ed. *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958. (P^{66})

________, and Barns, J. W. B., eds. *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément, Nouvelle édition augmentée et corrigée*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1962. (P^{66})

Testuz, Michel, ed. *Papyrus Bodmer VII-IX*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1959. (P^{72})

Martini, Carlo M., ed. *Beati Petri Apostoli Epistulae Ex Papyro Bodmeriana VIII Transcriptae*. Milan: Pizzi, 1968. (P^{72})

Martin, Victor, and Kasser, Rodolphe, eds. *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961. (P^{75})

________, eds. *Papyrus Bodmer XV*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961. (P^{75})

B. OTHER EDITIONS AND COLLATIONS

Aland, Kurt, and Aland, Barbara, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 26th ed. of Nestle-Aland. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979.

Aland, Kurt; Black, Matthew; Martini, Carlo M.; Metzger, Bruce M.; and Wikgren, Allen, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 3rd ed. New York, London, Edinburgh, Amsterdam, and Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975.

Beermann, Gustav, and Gregory, Caspar René, eds. *Die Koridethi Evangelien*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1913.

Burkitt, F. Crawford, ed. *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*. Vol. I: *Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Hunt, Arthur S., eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. IV. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904.

Griesbach, J. J. *Novum testamentum graece*. Vol. I. 9th ed. London: J. Mackinlay, 1809.

Harris, James Rendel. "An Important MS of the New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 9 (1890), pp. 31-59.

Horner, George W., ed. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic*. Vols. I-VII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911-24.

Hoskier, H. C., ed. *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*. Vol. II. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.

________, ed. *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2. r2*. London: Quaritch, 1919.

Jülicher, Adolf; Matzkow, Walter; and (for Vols. III and IV) Aland, Kurt, eds. *Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung*. Vol. I: *Matthäus-Evangelium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1938. Vol. II: *Marcus-Evangelium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1940. Vol. III: *Lucas-Evangelium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1954. Vol. IV: *Johannes-Evangelium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.

Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V-VIII) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*. Vol. I. London: British Museum, 1909.

Lake, Kirsopp, ed. "Codex 1241." In *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts*, edited by Kirsopp Lake and Silva New, pp. 95-140. Harvard Theological Studies, Vol. XVII. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

________; Zwaan, J. de; and Enslin, Morton S., eds. "Codex 1739." In *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts*, edited by Kirsopp Lake and Silva New, pp. 141-219. Harvard Theological Studies, Vol. XVII. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Legg, S. C. E., ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Evangelium secundum Marcum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935.

________, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Lewis, Agnes Smith, ed. *The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion Da-Mepharreshê*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1910.

Martini, Carlo M., ed. *Novum Testamentum e codice Vaticano graeco 1209 (Codex B): Tertia vice phototypice expressum*. Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1968.

Nestle, Eberhard; Nestle, Erwin; and Aland, Kurt, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 25th ed. of Nestle-Aland. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Platt, Thomas Pell, and Praetorius, Franz, eds. ወንጌል: ቅዱስ: Addis Ababa: American Bible Society, 1968. (Reprint of 1899 edition.)

Pusey, P. E.; Gwilliam, G. H.; and Gwynn, John, eds. *The New Testament in Syriac*. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1970. (Reprint of 1920 edition.)

Sanders, Henry A., ed. *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. IX. New York: Macmillan, 1918.

Soden, Hermann Freiherr von, ed. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. 2. Teil: *Text und Apparat*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913.

Tischendorf, Constantinus, ed. *Codex Claromontanus*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1852.

________, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Editio octava critica maior. Vols. I and II. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869 and 1872.

________, ed. *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum*. Leipzig: Giesecke et Devrient, 1867.

Walton, Brian, ed. *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*. Vol. V. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1964. (Reprint of 1657 edition.)

Wordsworth, J.; White, H. J.; and (for Vol. III) Sparks, H. F. D., eds. *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi ad codicum manuscriptorum fidem*. Vols. I, II, and III. Oxford: Clarendon, 1889-1954.

C. LEXICA AND GRAMMARS

Bauer, Walter. *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. Durchgesehener Nachdruck der fünften Auflage. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.

Blass, Friedrich, and Debrunner, Albert. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and edited by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

________, and Debrunner, Albert. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 14th ed., bearbeitet von Friedrich Rehkopf. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

UMI

Dillmann, August. *Ethiopic Grammar*. 2d edition revised by Carl Bezold, translated by James A. Crichton. London: Williams & Norgate, 1907.

________. *Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae*. New York: Ungar, 1955. (Reprint of 1865 edition.)

Gignac, Francis Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. I: *Phonology*. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità, Vol. LV. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1975.

Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed., revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. *A Supplement*, ed. E. A. Barber. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961.

Smith, J. Payne, ed. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Till, Walter C. *Koptische Grammatik*. 2., verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1961.

D. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Abbott, Edwin A. *Johannine Grammar*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906.

Aland, Kurt, ed. *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 5. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.

________. "Bemerkungen zum Alter und zur Entstehung des Christogrammes anhand von Beobachtungen bei P^{66} und P^{75}." In *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, pp. 173-79. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967.

________. "Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments." In *Materialien zur neutestamentlichen Handschriftenkunde*, edited by Kurt Aland, pp. 1-53. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.

________. "Die Konsequenzen der neueren Handschriftenfunde für die neutestamentliche Textkritik." In *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, pp. 180-201. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967.

________. *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Vol. I: *Gesamtübersicht*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.

________. "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II." *New Testament Studies*, 10 (1963-64), pp. 62-79, and 11 (1964-65), pp. 1-21.

________. "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri III." *New Testament Studies*, 20 (1973-74), pp. 357-81.

________. "Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus." In *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, pp. 91-136. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967.

________. "Papyrus Bodmer II: Ein erster Bericht." *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 82 (1957), cols. 161-84.

________, ed. *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*. Vol. I: *Biblische Papyri*. Patristische Texte und Studien, Vol. 18. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1976.

________. "Über die Bedeutung eines Punktes." In *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament*, edited by Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, pp. 161-87. Studies and Documents, Vol. XXIX. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.

________. "Über die Möglichkeit der Identifikation kleiner Fragmente neutestamentlicher Handschriften mit Hilfe des Computers." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 14-38. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Barr, James. Review of *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations*, by Bruce M. Metzger. *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 30 (1979), pp. 290-303.

Beare, Frank W. "Some Remarks on the Text of I Peter in the Bodmer Papyrus (P^{72})." In *Studia Evangelica*, Vol. III, Part II, edited by F. L. Cross, pp. 263-65. Texte und Untersuchungen, Vol. 88. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964.

________. "The Text of I Peter in Papyrus 72." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 80 (1961), pp. 253-60.

________. "The Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in P^{46}." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 63 (1944), pp. 379-96.

Benoit, P. "Le Codex paulinien Chester Beatty." *Revue biblique*, 46 (1937), pp. 58-82.

Birdsall, J. Neville. *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John*. London: The Tyndale Press, 1960.

________. "Rational Eclecticism and the Oldest Manuscripts: A Comparative Study of the Bodmer and Chester Beatty Papyri of the Gospel of Luke." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 39-51. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

________. "Rev. xiii. 6." Journal of Theological Studies, New Series 14 (1963), pp. 399-400.

________. "The Text of Jude in P^{72}." Journal of Theological Studies, New Series 14 (1963), pp. 394-99.

Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 3d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Boismard, M.-E. "Lectio brevior, potior." Revue biblique, 58 (1951), pp. 161-68.

________. Review of Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément, Nouvelle édition augmentée et corrigée, ed. by Victor Martin and J. W. B. Barns. Revue biblique, 70 (1963), pp. 120-33.

Brock, Sebastian P. "The Treatment of Greek Particles in the Old Syriac Gospels, with Special Reference to Luke." In Studies in New Testament Language and Text, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 80-86. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Brown, Raymond E. The Gospel According to John (i-xii). Anchor Bible, Vol. 29. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.

________. The Gospel According to John (xiii-xxi). Anchor Bible, Vol. 29A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1970.

Cadbury, Henry J. "The Name for Dives." Journal of Biblical Literature, 84 (1965), p. 73.

________. "A Proper Name for Dives." Journal of Biblical Literature, 81 (1962), pp. 399-402.

Clark, Albert C. "The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts, a Rejoinder." Journal of Theological Studies, 16 (1914-15), pp. 225-40.

Clemons, James T. "Some Questions on the Syriac Support for Variant Greek Readings." *Novum Testamentum*, 10 (1968), pp. 26-30.

Colwell, Ernest C. "External Evidence and New Testament Textual Criticism." In *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament*, edited by Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, pp. 1-12. Studies and Documents, Vol. XXIX. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.

________. "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and its Limitations." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, pp. 63-83. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 9. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969. (Originally published in 1947.)

________. "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, pp. 148-71. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 9. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969. (Originally published in 1968.)

________. "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, pp. 45-55. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 9. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969. (Originally published in 1961.)

________. "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P^{45}, P^{66}, P^{75}." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, pp. 106-24. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 9. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969. (Originally published in 1965.)

________. "Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, pp. 1-25. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 9. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969. (Originally published in 1958.)

UMI

________, and Tune, Ernest W. "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, by Ernest C. Colwell, pp. 96-105. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 9. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969. (Originally published in 1964.)

Davies, David P. "The Position of Adverbs in Luke." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 106-21. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Debrunner, Albert. "Über einige Lesarten der Chester Beatty Papyri des Neuen Testaments." *Coniectanea neotestamentica*, 11 (1947), pp. 33-49.

Duplacy, Jean. "Histoire des manuscrits et histoire du texte du N.T." *New Testament Studies*, 12 (1965-66), pp. 124-39.

Edwards, Sarah Alexander. "P^{75} under the Magnifying Glass." *Novum Testamentum*, 18 (1976), pp. 190-212.

Elliott, J. K. "Plaidoyer pour un éclectisme intégral appliqué à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament." *Revue biblique*, 84 (1977), pp. 5-25.

________. "The Two Forms of the Third Declension Comparative Adjectives in the New Testament." *Novum Testamentum*, 19 (1977), pp. 234-39.

Elliott, W. J. "The Need for an Accurate and Comprehensive Collation of All Known Greek NT Manuscripts with their Individual Variants noted *in pleno*." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 137-43. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Epp, Eldon Jay. "A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism?" *Harvard Theological Review*, 73 (1980), pp. 131-51.

________. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

________. "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant.'" In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 153-73. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

________. "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 93 (1974), pp. 386-414.

Eshbaugh, Howard. "Textual Variants and Theology: A Study of the Galatians Text of Papyrus 46." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 3 (1979), pp. 60-72.

Fee, Gordon D. "Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and the Nestle Greek Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 84 (1965), pp. 66-72.

________. "Modern Text Criticism and the Synoptic Problem." In *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, edited by Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff, pp. 154-69 and (notes) 214-18. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, Vol. 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

________. "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria." In *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, edited by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney, pp. 19-45. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

________. *Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics*. *Studies and Documents*, Vol. XXXIV. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

________. Review of _A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament_, by Bruce M. Metzger. _Biblica_, 55 (1974), pp. 452-55.

________. "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism--Which?" In _Studies in New Testament Language and Text_, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 174-97. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

________. "The Use of the Definite Article with Personal Names in the Gospel of John." _New Testament Studies_, 17 (1970-71), pp. 168-83.

Feine, Paul, and Behm, Johannes. _Introduction to the New Testament_. Edited by Werner Georg Kümmel, translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1966.

Finegan, Jack. _Encountering New Testament Manuscripts_. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1974.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke." _Catholic Biblical Quarterly_, 24 (1962), pp. 170-79.

Funk, Robert W. "Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}) and John 8,25." _Harvard Theological Review_, 51 (1958), pp. 95-100.

Greeven, Heinrich. "Erwägungen zur synoptischen Textkritik." _New Testament Studies_, 6 (1959-60), pp. 281-96.

Grieder, Theodore G. _The Isaac Foot Library_. Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa Barbara, 1963.

Grobel, K. "...Whose Name was Neves." _New Testament Studies_, 10 (1963-64), pp. 373-82.

Hackspill, L. "Die äthiopische Evangelienübersetzung (Math. I-X)." _Zeitschrift für Assyriologie_, 11 (1896), pp. 117-96, 367-88.

Havet, Louis. Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins. Paris: Hachette, 1911.

Hobbs, Edward. "An Introduction to Methods of Textual Criticism." In The Critical Study of Sacred Texts, edited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, pp. 1-27. Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1979.

Hofmann, Josef. Die äthiopische Johannes-Apokalypse kritisch untersucht. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, Vol. 297, Subsidia, Tomus 33. Louvain: Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, 1969.

________. "Das Neue Testament in äthiopischer Sprache: Probleme der Übersetzung und Stand der Forschung." In Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare, edited by Kurt Aland, pp. 345-73. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Vol. 5. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.

Hombert, Marcel. "Bulletin papyrologique XXV (1951)." Revue des études grecques, 66 (1953), pp. 295-376.

Hoskier, H. C. Appendix to an Article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles Known as P^{46}. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.

________. A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus P^{46} (circa 200 A.D.). London: Bernard Quaritch, 1938.

________, ed. The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXIII. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1928.

________. Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse. Vol. I. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.

________. P^{46}: Addenda et corrigenda. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937.

________. "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 38 (1937), pp. 148-63.

________. "Von Soden's Text of the New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 15 (1913-14), pp. 307-26.

Hunger, Herbert. "Zur Datierung des Papyrus Bodmer II (P66)." *Anzeiger der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1960, Nr. 4, pp. 12-33.

Kilpatrick, George D. "The Aorist of γαμεῖν in the New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 18 (1967), pp. 139-40.

________. "The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 4 (1963), pp. 33-47.

________. "The Chester Beatty Papyrus P^{46} and Hebrews xi. 4." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 42 (1941), pp. 68-69.

________. "Codex 565 of the Gospels." *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 25 (1969), p. 130.

________. "Eclecticism and Atticism." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*, 53 (1977), pp. 107-12.

________. "The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the *Textus Receptus*." In *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective*, edited by H. Anderson and W. Barclay, pp. 189-208. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.

________. "Griesbach and the Development of Text Criticism." In *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, edited by Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff, pp. 136-53 and (notes) 213-14. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, Vol. 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

———. "John iv 41 ΠΛΕΙΟΝ or ΠΛΕΙΟΥΣ." *Novum Testamentum*, 18 (1976), pp. 131-32.

———. *Literary Fashions and the Transmission of Texts in the Graeco-Roman World: Protocol of the Nineteenth Colloquy: 11 January 1976*, pp. 1-6. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1976.

———. Review of *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, by Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, bearbeitet von Friedrich Rehkopf, and *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief als Beitrag zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen*, by Walter Bujard. *Novum Testamentum*, 20 (1978), pp. 332-36.

———. *A Textus Receptus Redivivus? Protocol of the Thirty-Second Colloquy: 12 March 1978*, pp. 1-17. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1978.

———. "Three Problems of New Testament Text." *Novum Testamentum*, 21 (1979), pp. 289-92.

———. "Three Recent Editions of the Greek New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 50 (1949), pp. 10-23, 142-55.

King, Marchant A. "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Jude and 1 and 2 Peter." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 121 (1964), pp. 54-57.

———. "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 122 (1965), pp. 234-40.

Klijn, A. F. J. "Papyrus Bodmer II (John I-XIV) and the Text of Egypt." *New Testament Studies*, 3 (1956-57), pp. 327-34.

———. *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Part Two: 1949-1969. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XXI. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.

Kubo, Sakae. *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*. Studies and Documents, Vol. XXVII. Salt Lake city: University of Utah Press, 1965.

———. "Textual Relationships in Jude." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 276-82. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Lagrange, M.-J. "Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Épîtres de S. Paul et l'Apocalypse." *Revue Biblique*, 43 (1934), pp. 481-93.

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels: Excursus I: The Ecclesiastical Text." *Harvard Theological Review*, 21 (1928), 338-57.

Lee, J. A. L. "The Future of ζῆν in Late Greek." *Novum Testamentum*, 22 (1980), pp. 289-98.

Lefort, L. Th. "Le nom du mauvais riche (Lc 16 19) et la tradition copte." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 37 (1938), pp. 65-72.

Martini, Carlo M. *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV*. Analecta biblica, Vol. 26. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966.

Massaux, Édouard. "Le texte de la *I^{a} Petri* du Papyrus Bodmer VIII (P^{72})." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*, 39 (1963), pp. 616-71.

———. "Le texte de l'Épître de Jude du Papyrus Bodmer VII (P^{72})." In *Scrinium Lovaniense: Mélanges historiques Étienne Van Cauwenbergh*. Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 4^{e} Série, Fascicule 24, pp. 108-25. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1961.

Mees, Michael. "Unterschiedliche Lesarten in Bodmer Papyrus XV (P^{75}) und Codex Vaticanus aus Joh. 1-9." *Augustinianum*, 9 (1969), pp. 370-79.

Metzger, Bruce M. "The Bodmer Papyrus of Luke and John." *Expository Times*, 73 (1961-62), pp. 201-203.

________. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels." In *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, pp. 42-72. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963.

________. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

________. "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." *New Testament Studies*, 18 (1971-72), pp. 379-400.

________. "Recent Trends in the Textual Criticism of the Iliad and the Mahābhārata." In *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, pp. 142-54. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963.

________. *The Text of the New Testament*. 2d ed. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

________. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Meyers Kommentar, Vol. XIII. 12th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Milne, H. J. M., and Skeat, T. C. *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. London: British Museum, 1938.

Montgomery, James A. "The Ethiopic Text of Acts of the Apostles." *Harvard Theological Review*, 27 (1934), pp. 169-205.

UMI

Nestle, Eberhard. Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament. Translated by William Edie, edited by Allan Menzies. London: Williams and Norgate, 1901.

Nevius, Richard C. "The Use of the Definite Article with 'Jesus' in the Fourth Gospel." New Testament Studies, 12 (1965-66), pp. 81-85.

Osburn, Carroll D. "The Text of Jude 22-23." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 63 (1972), pp. 139-44.

Parvis, Merrill M. "The Need for a New Apparatus Criticus to the Greek New Testament." Journal of Biblical Literature, 65 (1946), pp. 353-69.

Porter, Calvin L. "An Analysis of the Textual Variation between Pap75 and Codex Vaticanus in the Text of John." In Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament, edited by Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, pp. 71-80. Studies and Documents, Vol. XXIX. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.

________. "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus." Journal of Biblical Literature, 81 (1962), pp. 363-76.

Quinn, Jerome D. "Notes on the Text of the P^{72} 1 Pt 2,3; 5,14; and 5,9." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 27 (1965), pp. 241-49.

Rhodes, Erroll F. "The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II." New Testament Studies, 14 (1967-68), pp. 271-81.

Roberts, C. H. "The Codex." Proceedings of the British Academy, 40 (1954), pp. 169-204.

Royse, James R. "The Ethiopic Support for Codex Vaticanus in Acts." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 71 (1980), pp. 258-62.

________. "Response" to George D. Kilpatrick, *A Textus Receptus Redivivus? Protocol of the Thirty-Second Colloquy: 12 March 1978*, pp. 27-30. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1978.

________. "Scribal Habits in the Transmission of New Testament Texts." In *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, edited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, pp. 139-61. Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1979.

________. "The Treatment of Scribal Leaps in Metzger's *Textual Commentary*." *New Testament Studies*, forthcoming.

________. "'Their Fifteen Enemies': The Text of Rev. xi. 12 in P^{47} and 1611." *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 31 (1980), pp. 78-80.

________. "Von Soden's Accuracy." *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series 30 (1979), pp. 166-71.

Sanders, James A. "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 98 (1979), pp. 5-29.

Savignac, Jean de. "Les fragments du papyrus Bodmer II de l'Évangile johannique." *Scriptorium*, 14 (1960), pp. 333-38.

Schedl, Claus. "Zur Schreibung von Joh I 10A in Papyrus Bodmer XV." *Novum Testamentum*, 14 (1972), pp. 238-40.

Schmid, Josef. "Der Apokalypsetext des Chester Beatty Papyrus P^{47}." *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 11 (1934), pp. 81 [after p. 64] - 108.

________. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*. 1. Teil: *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia*, *Text*. Munich: Karl Zink, 1955.

________. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*. 2. Teil: *Die alten Stämme*. Munich: Karl Zink, 1955.

Scrivener, F. H. A. *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*. 3d ed. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1883.

Selwyn, Edward Gordon. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. 2d ed. London: Macmillan, 1947.

Shipley, Frederick William. *Certain Sources of Corruption in Latin Manuscripts*. New York: Macmillan, 1904.

Smothers, Edgar R. "Two Readings in Papyrus Bodmer II." *Harvard Theological Review*, 51 (1958), pp. 109-22.

Soden, Hermann Freiherr von. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. 1. Teil: *Untersuchungen*. Berlin: Arthur Glaue, 1902-10.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels*. 5th impression. London: Macmillan, 1936.

Tarelli, C. C. "Omissions, Additions, and Conflations in the Chester Beatty Papyrus." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 40 (1939), pp. 382-87.

________. "Some Further Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 43 (1942), pp. 19-25.

________. "Some Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 39 (1938), pp. 254-59.

Tasker, R. V. G. "The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Apocalypse of John." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 50 (1949), pp. 60-68.

________. "The Nature of the Text of the Chester-Beatty Papyrus in Acts." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 38 (1937), pp. 383-94.

________. "The Text of the 'Corpus Paulinum.'" New Testament Studies, 1 (1954-55), pp. 180-91.

Teeple, H. M., and Walker, F. A. "Notes on the Plates in Papyrus Bodmer II." Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959), pp. 148-52.

Tischendorf, Constantinus. Novum Testamentum Graece. Vol. III: Prolegomena, scripsit C. R. Gregory. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1894.

Treu, Kurt. "Papyri und Majuskeln." In Studies in New Testament Language and Text, edited by J. K. Elliott, pp. 373-86. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XLIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Turner, E. G. Greek Papyri: An Introduction. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Weigandt, Peter. "Zum Text von Joh. X 7: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der koptischen Bibelübersetzung." Novum Testamentum, 9 (1967), pp. 43-51.

Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Hort, Fenton John Anthony. The New Testament in the Original Greek. Vol. II: Introduction [and] Appendix. 2d ed. London: Macmillan, 1896.

Wikgren, Allen. "Response" to George D. Kilpatrick, A Textus Receptus Redivivus? Protocol of the Thirty-Second Colloquy: 12 March 1978, pp. 41-46. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1978.

________. "Some Problems in Jude 5." In Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament, edited by Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, pp. 147-52. Studies and Documents, Vol. XXIX. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.

Zimmermann, Heinrich. Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre. 3d ed. Stuttgart: Verlag Kath. Bibelwerk, 1970.

________. "Papyrus Bodmer II und seine Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte des Johannes-Evangeliums." Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge 2 (1958), pp. 214-43.

Zuntz, Günther. The Text of the Epistles. London: The British Academy, 1953.